

The Office of this JOURNAL and of the WEEKLY REPORTER is now at 12, Cook's-court, Carey-street, W.C.

The Subscription to the SOLICITORS' JOURNAL is—Town, 26s. Country 28s.; with the WEEKLY REPORTER, 52s. Payment in advance includes Double Numbers and Postage. Subscribers can have their Volumes bound at the Office—cloth, 2s. 6d., half law calf, 4s. 6d.

All Letters intended for publication in the "Solicitors' Journal" must be authenticated by the name of the writer, though not necessarily for publication.

Where difficulty is experienced in procuring the Journal with regularity in the Provinces, it is requested that application be made direct to the Publisher.

The Solicitors' Journal.

LONDON, FEBRUARY 17, 1872.

THE "ALABAMA" CLAIMS have done the Government a good turn in dwarfing by contrast all other questions, and pre-disposing the Legislature to throw aside all home discords in uniting against a Transatlantic claimant. Most people have discovered in the Chancellor's persistent refusal to explain the Collier appointment at the time of the Lord Chief Justice's remonstrance, a recognition on the part of the Government of the fact that time softens even the justest irritation, and that the chapter of accidents may befriended even a British Government. The House of Lords on Thursday night divided on Earl Stanhope's motion condemnatory of the Government action in the *affaire Collier*; 87 Peers voted for the motion, and 89 against it, a narrow majority of two, which the Government will hardly consider a triumphant affirmation of their rule of statute interpretation. What the House of Commons will resolve remains to be seen, Sir Roundell Palmer's motion not being due till Monday. Upon the merits of the question there is nothing new to be said. Indeed, it is an advantage on the side of the Government, that their violation has already been described, identified and detailed *usque ad nauseam*. The Duke of Argyll, on Thursday, was nearly comic in his denunciation of the Lord Chief Justices' letter as a "railing accusation, almost a ribald accusation," against the Government.

THE LETTER OF MR. JUSTICE WILLES to the Lord Chancellor respecting the Collier-*per saltum* affair has surprised everyone. And it is surprising to find a judge, who has achieved so great a reputation for sagacity, thinking it consistent with that reputation to write a letter which is as much an "evasion" as that perpetrated by the Premier and the Chancellor. Mr. Justice Willes says, "The appointment was legal, and within the terms of the statute"—undoubtedly, or it would not now exist to be visited with censure—"evasion of the law, by appointing a fit man according to the law, is a sensational expression. The appointment . . . was no evasion of the Act." We do not mean to accuse Mr. Justice Willes of intentionally playing with his words, but here is certainly an evasion, or an evitavion, of the gist of the matter. "Appointing a fit man according to the law" is a *petitio principii*, unless "according to the law" means something more than according to the letter of the law without its spirit, and the learned judge has carefully avoided giving any opinion as to whether the appointment is within the Act in the true sense in which judges interpret Acts, reading the letter by the light of the mischief to be remedied, and the object to be attained.

THE LORD CHANCELLOR, in his eager defence, on Thursday last, of his nomination of Mr. Beales as a county court judge, fell into two very astonishing blunders.

Mr. Beales, he said, had been deprived of an income of £700 to £800 a-year as a revising barrister because it was supposed he might be suspected of partiality. Further, Mr. Beales, "for the post of which he was deprived had abandoned business in the Court of Chancery, which he always discharged well. His deprivation of office reduced him to ruin."

We are at a loss to know how the Lord Chancellor can have brought himself to suppose that Mr. Beales really abandoned his regular business for the post of revising barrister. Everyone, and especially a Lord Chancellor, is presumed to know the law, yet Lord Hatherley is clearly unaware that by the Registration Act, 1843 (6 Vict. c. 18, s. 32) the duties of a revising barrister must of necessity be discharged between the 15th September and the 31st October in each year. In other words, all his duties must be performed in vacation time. It is this circumstance that makes revisorships so much coveted by practising barristers, as the duties of the office cannot by any possibility come into inconvenient collision with regular professional work. Again, the Lord Chancellor is entirely in error as to the salary attached to the office. A revising barrister's fee is £210 (6 Vict. c. 18, s. 59), and out of this sum he has to pay all his personal and travelling expenses (if any) whilst on his registration circuit. Mr. Beales' appointment may be capable of justification upon other grounds, but those given by the Lord Chancellor certainly furnish no defence of it. If the appointment was really made for the reasons given, it was made under an entire and most singular misconception of the losses suffered by Mr. Beales.

A SPECIAL PARLIAMENTARY RETURN has just been issued relating to the business of County Courts in 1870. It gives full details of every day the courts have sat, the number of summonses returnable on each day, and the number disposed of by the judges. Nearly all the judges have delegated the power of hearing undefended cases to the Registrars, under the County Courts Act, 1867, thus materially lightening the labours of the judges. The effect on the registrars may be estimated by reference to a few facts contained in the return. We find, for instance, that at Oldham and Rochdale the summonses returnable for each sitting number commonly from 300 to 600, and of these the judge disposes of about five per cent. How the registrar disposes of his portion it is not easy to imagine, as 600 cases would occupy ten hours, at the rate of one per minute. At Nottingham over 600 cases per day occurred frequently, but Leicester bears away the palm with the following numbers, returnable on five court days respectively. 574, 598, 670, 747, and 832! There are several other courts in which the numbers per day fall little short of the lowest figures quoted, but these courts bear but a small proportion to the whole. As a general rule, in the larger courts about 150 cases appears to be the maximum and about 100 the minimum. In all the London courts this rule is especially applicable, as we seldom find the day's work fall short of 100 cases or exceed 150. Persons acquainted with the London courts will doubtless be of opinion that judges and registrars have enough to do on court days, and will probably wonder how business is managed in the Midland Counties. In bankruptcy matters the return contains little that is noticeable, beyond the fact that at five courts the judges have abdicated their functions and "delegated" them to the registrars, whilst one judge has retained only the power of committal for contempt.

THE CASE OF *Dawkins v. Lord Rokeby*, which has occupied the attention of the Exchequer Chamber for some time during the past week, raises some very important questions of constitutional law about which there has hitherto been a great diversity of judicial opinion. The action was for slander and libel, and was brought by the plaintiff, a lieutenant-colonel in the Coldstream

Guards, against the defendant, as general of division. It appeared at the trial before Mr. Justice Blackburn that, in consequence of long-standing disagreements between the plaintiff and his colonel, Lord F. Paulet, a court of inquiry was held in 1865, the object of which was to ascertain the plaintiff's fitness for command. Lord Rokeby was examined before the Court, and his evidence was to the effect that Colonel Dawkins was unfit for command by reason of various alleged faults of temper and disposition, and he was placed on half-pay in consequence. At the close of the examination Lord Rokeby, *unasked*, handed in a written statement to the same effect. These statements, oral and written, were the subject-matter of the action. Mr. Justice Blackburn was of opinion at the trial that there was no cause of action, even assuming express malice, and directed the jury accordingly, rejecting evidence that the defendant had been guilty of wilful falsehood. A bill of exceptions was then tendered, upon which the recent elaborate argument has been founded.

There can be no doubt that the learned judge sitting at Nisi Prius could have taken no other course, for the recent case of *Dawkins v. Lord F. Paulet*, upon which we commented at length when it was decided,* substantially decided that no action will lie by an inferior officer against his superior for statements made during the proceedings of a court of inquiry, even though those statements are malicious. Such was the effect of the decision by the Court of Queen's Bench (Mellor and Lush, JJ., Cockburn, C.J., dissenting) in that, a case which, owing to the defendant's death, was never carried to error. The Exchequer Chamber therefore really had to determine whether they would uphold the judgment of Cockburn, C.J., or of the two other judges. They have come to a conclusion in conformity with the majority of the Court of Queen's Bench. At present their reasons are reserved, but we presume that they will base their judgment upon considerations of public policy. It may be that a contrary view would be injurious to military discipline. At the same time we must repeat what we urged when we referred to the subject on the occasion of *Dawkins v. Lord Paulet* being decided. It certainly does appear to us to be carrying the doctrine of privilege very far to hold that, just because a man is the superior officer of another he may publish, uninvited, statements about his inferior which are not only untrue, but wilfully untrue. Yet to this extent the judgment of the Exchequer Chamber must go. It is founded on the assumption that Lord Rokeby was guilty of express malice in handing in his written statement. That assumption might have turned out to be utterly false in fact; but, as evidence of its truth was rejected, the argument of the bill of exceptions necessarily proceeded on the hypothesis of its being true. The effect of the decision is that, in one respect at least, a man by becoming a soldier ceases to have the same rights as a civilian.

THE CASE of *Nollett v. Robinson*, lately heard (can we venture to say decided?) in the Court of Exchequer Chamber, is a singular instance of fortuitous law. The plaintiff recovered a verdict at the trial, leave being reserved to the defendant to move to enter a nonsuit. Upon the hearing of the rule which was obtained in pursuance of this leave the Court was equally divided, and the rule was therefore treated as discharged. The plaintiff therefore kept his verdict. The defendant appealed, and here again the Court is equally divided—Kelly, C.B., Channell, B. and Blackburn, J., adhering to the opinion of Bovill, C.J., and Montague Smith, J., in the Court below, and pronouncing their opinion in favour of the plaintiff; Mellor and Hannen, JJ., and Cleasby, B., agreeing with Willes and Keating, JJ. in favour of the defendant. Of course, therefore, the decision of the Court below stands affirmed; by an

accident the plaintiff is successful, but the law can no more be thought to be settled than it was by the equal division of opinion in the House of Lords in *Reg. v. Mills* (10 Cl. & F. 534). The last-mentioned tribunal alone is now capable of resolving the difficulty, and it is to be hoped that there at least unanimity may be found.

The case, with the particulars of which our readers are no doubt well acquainted (18 W. R. 1160, L. R. 5 C. P. 646), may probably be determined without deciding the general questions raised, whether the usages of a market by which the person commissioning or dealing there is to be held bound must be reasonable usages, or whether, though such a usage may control the mode of performing such a commission, it cannot change its character. The plaintiff, who sought to compel the defendant to accept tallow purchased for him by the plaintiff, as his broker, had really and in substance acted as broker and as nothing else; the bought-notes which he made out to the defendant were identical in every essential particular but quantity with the contracts made by him with the sellers, and these were made out and forwarded immediately after the contracts with the sellers had been entered into; what was done therefore amounted merely to distributing the tallow bought among his several principals, without any advantage arising to the plaintiff himself out of the transaction except the commission which he had fairly earned. Nor is it possible to see how his principals were in any respect damaged; for we cannot agree with Willes, J., that in the event of the plaintiff's bankruptcy before delivery the principals would have been deprived of the benefit of their bargain. The defence, therefore, seems of a purely technical character.

THE CASE of *Frost v. Knight* (19 W. R. 77) has at last received its decision from the Exchequer Chamber, and the effect is to reverse the decision of the Court below. It will be remembered that in this case defendant had promised to marry plaintiff when his father died, and marrying some one else during his father's lifetime, plaintiff brought her action for breach of promise, thus raising the question, whether the action for breach of a contract to marry at a certain time would lie before that time had arrived. The Court of Exchequer held that this action was not maintainable, and that decision is now reversed. This result was, we believe, expected; it is certainly the only one which would be reconcilable with the principle of *Hochster v. De la Tour* (1 W. R. 469), for the distinction supposed to be found between a contract for marriage and other kinds of contracts is merely superficial. If such a contract is once recognised as of a pecuniary value, no reason can be given why it should be placed in any different position from other contracts in respect of its breach. The difficulty as to assessment of damages is merely a question of degree; and upon the other hand, the importance to the contracting parties of keeping the engagement entire, "unimpaired and unimpeached," is probably greater than in any other kind of contract.

A LEGAL JOURNAL seldom has to notice cases depending on facts rather than on law; yet we ought to call attention to the case of *Gilchrist v. Herbert*, decided by the Master of the Rolls last Monday as one which practitioners in both branches of the profession will do well to take note of. The bill was filed for specific performance of an alleged contract to make a testamentary disposition in favour of the plaintiff, a perfectly well recognised description of suit. The plaintiff, a widow, alleged that in 1861 her late husband gave her a written promise that if she would reject a certain other suitor and marry himself, he would leave her half his property by will. She married him in 1863, and he dying in 1868, without having made for her any such testamentary provision, the bill in the suit was filed in 1870. Setting aside a short

* See 14 Sol. Jour. 127, 148.

legal point as to the relevancy of a Stamp Act, the whole case turned on the evidence of the existence of the contract alleged by the plaintiff, for the plaintiff did not produce the document, asserting that it had been lost. It is within the province of the Court of Equity, in its remedial jurisdiction, to relieve where deeds or documents have been lost; and though the Court is doubtless chary of directing specific performance in such cases, lest it should be misled by the parol testimony into enforcing something which the parties did not agree to, and considering that everything may depend on the *ipsissima verba*—yet if the Court can satisfy itself, upon the evidence, of the precise terms of a lost document, there is no reason why it should not enforce specific performance of the contract embodied.

The question in the present case turned wholly on the evidence of the existence of the alleged document. The plaintiff said the document was lost, with her luggage, on the passage from Aden to Galle in April, 1864, and the plaintiff admittedly had made the passage, encountering a cyclone. On the other hand, it appeared that the plaintiff and her husband cohabited for a few months only after the marriage, and she soon afterwards began, and subsequently compromised, a suit for restitution of conjugal rights, and much negotiation took place concerning allowances, &c., during the whole of which the plaintiff never referred in her correspondence to the alleged promise. Yet witnesses, including the rejected suitor, deposed to the contents of the missing document. The Master of the Rolls, after weighing all the evidence, arrived at the conclusion that the plaintiff's allegation was made out; the case, however, will be appealed. We do not wish, in the face of an appeal against a decision on a question of evidence, to dwell upon inferences or arguments. The case seems to have been extremely well argued, and will doubtless be well argued upon the appeal. It seems a case so *practically* instructive that a report of it will be given in the *Weekly Reporter* next week, and we advise our readers to take note of it.

ON TUESDAY LAST the Lords Justices decided a point of practice of considerable importance in the liquidation of companies. We refer to *Re The Contract Corporation, Gooch's case*. A Mr. Gooch held some shares in this company; these shares he, in January, 1865, transferred to an infant, and the transfer was accepted by the company and registered. This infant, in August, 1865, transferred the shares to another infant, who in December, 1865, transferred the shares to a person of full age, who was accepted by the company, and registered as the holder. The winding-up of the company commenced in March, 1866. The official liquidator sought to place the executor of Mr. Gooch, who had meanwhile died, on the A. list of contributories in respect of the shares, on the ground that Mr. Gooch had never ceased to be a member of the company; or in the alternative, to place the executor on the B. list, on the ground that Mr. Gooch did not cease to be a member until a competent transferee was registered in his stead, which happened within a year before the commencement of the winding-up.

The executor, for the purposes of his defence, took out a summons calling upon the official liquidator to make the common affidavit as to documents in his possession relating to the matter in dispute, and the Master of the Rolls ordered this affidavit to be made. The liquidator appealed, and it was contended on his behalf that he was a mere officer of the court, and not in a position in any respect analogous to that of a defendant to a suit. It was urged that enormous expense and inconvenience would be caused if at the instance of every alleged contributory the liquidator could be compelled to search through all the documents of the company in his

possession, in order that he should be in a position to state upon oath which of these documents in any way related to the measure in dispute. In the case of this particular company it was stated that the documents in possession of the liquidator weighed several tons.

The Lords Justices took some time to consider their judgment, and in the result acceded to the view of the liquidator. They were of opinion that the official liquidator stood in the position of a receiver and manager in a partnership suit, and not as a general rule in that of a litigant defendant. It was his duty to give to every person interested access to the documents in his possession, and to afford him every assistance and facility in discovering which of the documents were relevant to his case; but the liquidator could not be called upon to undertake in every case the investigation necessary in order that he should make the ordinary affidavit as to documents. Lord Justice James, in giving judgment, pointed out that in seeking to place a man who had transferred his shares on the list of existing members of the company, the liquidator represented the company, and was bound to make such discovery as the company could have been compelled to give in a suit. He was bound, therefore, to make discovery of everything relating to the particular shares in question since the alleged contributory had transferred them. But the existing company had no concern with the B. list—that was a measure solely between the creditors (or some of them) and the past shareholders. The contest as to the B. list his Lordship described as “a free fight,” in which the duty of the liquidator was to see that everyone had “a fair field and no favour,” while he was not for any purpose a party or *quasi* party to that litigation. It is somewhat singular that this question should now for the first time have been brought before the Court. The only previous case at all resembling this seems to be *Re Barnard's Banking Company, Ex parte The Contract Corporation* (15 W. R. 524, L. R. 2 Ch. 350), but that was a question of production of documents by an official liquidator when summoned as a witness by an alleged contributory; and moreover, the contest in that case was with regard to the A. list.

GREAT UNCERTAINTY PREVAILS in the London County Courts as to whether the 27th is to be observed as a holiday. They can only be closed on that day by royal proclamation declaring the day a thanksgiving day, or by special order of the Lord Chancellor. It will be a curious anomaly if they only of all the public offices should be open, for the probability is that they will do about the same amount of business closed as open.

THE JUDICATURE COMMISSION.

The legal profession and the general public have been long watching, and with increasing impatience, for the second report of the Judicature Commission. We have all been inclined to ask, If all the talents have not been able to make up their minds to something by this time, what chance is there of their ever doing so? The Commissioners found out, we suppose, that something must be done to satisfy the public; and accordingly a series of resolutions have been published within the last week, to which we presume the Commission is finally committed. The question which will occur to most people after reading them will be, If it has taken all these months and years to produce these few rough, sketchy suggestions upon half-a-dozen points or so, when will an exhaustive and detailed report be completed? At the present rate of progress, we should say about by the time the new Law Courts are finished. However, such crumbs of information as we can get we must deal with when we get them.

Some of the present resolutions relate not exclusively to the Superior Court, nor exclusively to the County

Courts, but to the wider subject of the relation and interdependence between the various Court. Thus, resolution 16 says that the County Courts are to be annexed to, and form branches of, the High Court, and the County Court judges and officers to become officers of the High Court. This resolution sounds well, but it conveys no distinct meaning whatsoever. It may mean anything or nothing. It may mean merely that a certain change of name shall take place; or it may be intended to suggest that the different classes of Courts should be really made auxiliary to one another, take the evidence of witnesses, for instance, and do other such services; or that the High Court should exercise some more direct control over the County Courts than at present. Until we know what practical proposition is really to be made upon the matter, we cannot of course express either approval or disapproval. This resolution does not help us. The next resolution, No. 17, is more distinct. It proposes that in any action for a claim over £20, process may issue at any office either of the High Court or of a County Court. This proposal seems to us an excellent one. But being that, by the previous resolution, every office of a County Court would be an office of the High Court, there seem to be some unnecessary words in it.

With regard to the High Court itself, the most important proposals are those aimed at supplying the wants of the northern counties (resolutions 6 to 13). These proposals are founded upon what we think is clearly the sound principle. We are strongly of opinion that the true remedy for existing defects is not Local Courts, but Central Courts with local sittings, and, as far as possible, local procedure. Local Courts involve isolation, variety of decision, uncertainty in the law. The County Courts show it. Central Courts secure uniformity of decision, certainty in the law. What is here proposed is that a north western and a north eastern district should be formed to comprise Lancashire, Yorkshire, and the Northern Counties. That one judge of the Superior Court should take charge of each of these, and should hold constant sittings for the trial of causes, except during vacation or circuit, in the principal towns. He is to try also all Admiralty causes, and such criminal causes as would be reserved for the assizes. All interlocutory applications which by the rules of the High Court can be heard by one judge, are to be heard on the spot.

This scheme, only the bare outlines of which are sketched out in the resolutions, is, we think, the best which has yet been suggested for supplying the admitted wants of Lancashire and Yorkshire. As to the rest of the kingdom, it is proposed that the Circuits shall be re-arranged, it is not said on what principle; and registers or offices are to be established at suitable places for intercounty business.

With regard to County Courts, the proposals of the Commissioners are stated in more detail. It is proposed, in the first place, to relieve the judges of much of their work. For the present registrars are to be substituted paid registrars at fixed salaries, who are to try all cases under £5, and cases above that limit by consent. We presume it is intended that these registrars shall not be allowed to practise; and we venture to predict that the salary will have to be fixed at a high standard if the best class of attorneys are to be brought to accept the post. The smaller County Courts are to be abolished altogether. The number of the judges is to be reduced, and their circuits consolidated, but to what extent is not indicated. Rumour says that the number of judges is to be reduced by one-half. With regard to jurisdiction, the language of the resolutions is so ambiguous that we shall not venture to put a meaning upon it without allowing our readers to see the very words used, and to judge for themselves. One thing is clear. By resolution 1, any action may be commenced in a County Court subject to the defendant's right to remove *for cause shown* (whether shown in the Superior Court or in the County Court does not appear), "if it involves a sum

exceeding the present limit." Whether this means £50, the present limit of County Court jurisdiction, or £20, the present limit which, under 19 & 20 Vict. c. 108, s. 39, gives the right to remove, we do not know. The remaining proposals are as follows:—

"18. That where the existing limit of the jurisdiction of the County Court is £20 the same should be extended to £50. 19. That where the existing limit of the jurisdiction of the County Court is £10, the same should be extended to £50. 20. That such jurisdiction of the County Court as last mentioned shall not be limited to certain kinds of torts, but should extend to all actions of tort. 21. That if in any action in the High Court the plaintiff shall recover a sum not exceeding £50, the costs (if any) allowed him shall not exceed the amount which he would have been allowed if the action had been commenced and prosecuted in the County Court, unless a judge shall otherwise order. 22. That a judge may order the plaintiff to compensate the defendant for any additional costs incurred by him in consequence of the action not having been commenced and prosecuted in the County Court. 23. That in all actions commenced and prosecuted in the High Court, in which the amount recovered, or sought to be recovered, does not exceed £100, the costs (if any be recoverable) shall be taxed on a lower scale than that from time to time applicable to other actions in the High Court unless a judge shall otherwise order.

The £20 limit in resolution 18 refers, we presume, to the cases of ejectment, and of claims involving title. What the £10 limit referred to may be we do not know. We should have thought that perhaps the commissioners were thinking of the restrictions upon suing in the Superior Courts by denial of costs; but the next resolution, No. 20, shows that they are really dealing with the subject of County Court jurisdiction, the subject of costs being dealt with in the following resolutions arrived at on a later day.

The result of the whole seems to be that it is proposed to extend the operation of the County Courts in two ways; first, directly, by allowing any action to be brought there subject to the right of removal; secondly, indirectly, by the penalty of costs. That the first of these provisions, taken by itself, would produce no very overwhelming effect is, from past experience, tolerably certain. Hitherto every enactment allowing people to go to the County Court, if not accompanied by a penalty in the matter of costs, has proved little more than a dead letter. But the other proposal, that as to costs, is quite another matter. That it must, if adopted, have the effect of driving an immense amount of litigation out of the Superior Courts and into the County Courts is, we think, plain. Then is this a desirable thing or an undesirable? Unhappily, the Commissioners have not given us the means of forming a judgment. If the future Courts are to be merely a continuation of the present, we have no hesitation in saying that the proposal will do harm. If the new County Courts, with their reduced number of judges and consolidated circuits, are to be safely entrusted with a largely-increased share of the judicial business of the country, certain conditions must at least be complied with. We must have some security that the judges shall be honestly chosen on the ground of their fitness; that a County Court judgeship shall not for the future be what it has generally been in the past—the reward for political services, or a token of personal friendship. Secondly, the jury system must be radically reformed; so that in those cases for which a jury is the fittest tribunal, the case may be as efficiently dealt with as it is in a Superior Court. Thirdly, some method must be provided, whether by a bench of judges from time to time sitting together or otherwise, by which difficult points of law arising in the course of trials may be more fully considered than they can be by one judge, and more quickly than by any process of appeal. Fourthly, proper provision must be made for all such interlocutory applications as may be necessary in the course of a cause. We might easily add to this list of requirements. It is enough to say that the County

Courts of the future, if much additional work of the heavier kind is to be thrown upon them, ought to be quite unlike the County Courts of the present. And it is very unfortunate that the Commissioners, when determining to send business to these Courts, have not had time to consider what sort of Courts they ought to be.

Many of the lesser proposals as to County Courts, such as that for assimilating the proceedings in all the various branches of their jurisdiction, are obviously useful; so obviously so, indeed, that it hardly needed a Royal Commission to find it out. Others, as that the parties should be allowed to serve their own process, are of much more doubtful utility. In cases above a certain amount this may be all very well. But if applied in the smaller cases the consequence will, we fear, be that half of every day in a County Court will be spent in trying the sufficiency of service in the undefended causes.

The sweeping proposals now made to abolish the miscellaneous inferior Courts, such as the Mayor's Court in London and the Tolzey Court at Bristol, will surprise no one.

What will surprise every one, we suspect, is that from beginning to end of these resolutions the word bankruptcy never occurs, except once in connection with the Stannaries Court. Yet bankruptcy is perhaps the most important part of County Court jurisdiction, and one which must be dealt with in any reform of the County Court system. Have the Commissioners no views on the subject? Or is it that they have only too many views; every man a view of his own?

Such is the result of so many years of labour of the Commission. A few rough hints upon some isolated points of the great subjects remitted to them. If any one has hitherto had a doubt about the total incapacity of this great unwieldy Commission to do the work it was appointed to do, that doubt must now, we think, vanish.

BILLS IN PARLIAMENT.

The Ballot Bill, Corrupt Practices Bill, Registration of Voters Bill, and Public Prosecutors Bill have been already introduced in the House of Commons and printed. These measures are all reproductions of similar, if not identical, schemes of last session. In each case, however, there are variations, some of substance and some of form. We shall probably have occasion hereafter to comment upon the various provisions of these bills in more detail than is possible at present. We propose now shortly to point out the principal differences between the measures proposed this session, and those proposed last year.

It will be remembered that the Ballot Bill of last session contained provisions relating to the expenses of elections, and also as to corrupt practices, and election offences. These latter were subsequently dropped, to lighten the ship. This year, two separate measures have been introduced. One a short bill relating to corrupt practices, and the other to the procedure at elections. The provisions as to expenses of elections being borne by the constituencies have, however, disappeared altogether. The provisions of the Corrupt Practices Bill are substantially those of last year. The Attorney-General in introducing the bill is reported to have stated as a novelty that it made personation a misdemeanour punishable with two years' imprisonment. This certainly is not so, but it is probable that what he said was misunderstood. The bill does not increase the punishment which can now be inflicted for personation, but it gives a new definition of the offence applicable to the new method of voting, and including cases not within the old law. It also (and this is perhaps the principal, if not the only new security introduced against personation) makes it the duty of the returning officer to prosecute in cases where he has reason to suspect personation, and provides for the costs of such prosecutions.

As regards the Ballot Bill, its provisions are substantially those of the bill which passed the Commons last year. The principle is that of absolute secrecy, without any counterfoils (as proposed in 1870) or other means of securing a complete scrutiny. Only a partial scrutiny will therefore be possible. This is a matter of very grave importance, and not a mere question of detail, like so many of the points which were so warmly discussed last year. It seems to be the intention of Parliament that a ballot measure should become law this session; and assuming this to be so, the principal question to which attention should be called is whether a system under which absolute secrecy will be obtained at a sacrifice of all possibility of a satisfactory scrutiny, is to be preferred to a system under which the attainment of practical secrecy in all ordinary cases is combined with the possibility of a scrutiny. The counterfoils of the bill of 1870 provided efficiently for a system of the latter kind, and we think that they should not be lightly abandoned. It must be remembered that, under the counterfoil plan, voting-papers and counterfoils were to be stored away separately, that no vote could be identified till its voting-paper and counterfoil were brought together, and that the identification of any one vote was entirely independent of the secrecy of the remainder. It is thought by many that after the introduction of the ballot, "personation" will be the chief form in which electioneering dirty work will be carried on. If the principle of the present measure is adopted, it will be impossible to distinguish and reject the false vote, though the fact of the personation may be detected, and the vote of the real elector added. It is true that a proposition, valuable as far as it goes, is made, that upon proof of personation being procured by an agent of any candidate, a vote shall be struck off the poll of that candidate. Experience, however, teaches that it is extremely difficult to bring home such things to agents of candidates. And it will be still more difficult to do it in the case of personation than in the case of bribery, because often, although the fact of the personation has become apparent, the personator may not be known. Moreover, when the act can be traced to an agent, the election of the candidate will be avoided for the corrupt practice without any scrutiny, and therefore it will only be in rare cases that this provision will be of any value.

The consequence is, that it will be impossible, without a scrutiny, to prevent the offence of personation from achieving on each occasion of its occurrence the success of adding one false vote for the candidate in whose interest the offence is committed. It is not, however, personation alone that is checked by admitting the possibility of a scrutiny. Wholesale frauds upon the register by means of fictitious claims are now not very common, although by no means difficult to perpetrate. They are likely to become much more common if the register is made conclusive, and if there is no means of tracing how the votes of the persons thus getting on the register have been given.

The principal alteration in this bill from that of last year is in its form, in which there is a great improvement this year. The bill itself is comparatively short, enacting generally the mode of procedure to be adopted, while all the regulations as to details, both as regards nominations and polling, are contained in schedules. The result is, that the whole is much more intelligible. There are a few alterations in detail which are, on the whole, improvements. Thus, more facilities are given to agents of candidates for checking the accounts of returning officers as to ballot papers. All papers except actual ballot papers are to be open to inspection, and the latter may be inspected by order of a superior Court, made after satisfactory proof that the inspection is wanted for a *bona fide* purpose. It does not appear that any proceeding need have been commenced before

application is made for this order; thus, it will be possible, before commencing any petition for such a limited scrutiny as is to be possible, to ascertain approximately the chances of success, and thus a difficulty to which we have alluded on previous occasions, will be obviated. We observe also that under the bill of this year no assistance is to be given to persons who cannot read. We have always advocated leaving such persons to themselves, since if their votes are lost it can be no great loss to the community. The form of ballot paper, however, is to be such that mistakes ought not to be frequent. The names of the candidates are to be given in alphabetical order and numbered with large figures. The surnames are to be printed large, so as to catch the eye, and the particular description of the candidate is to be given below each name in smaller type. The provisions of the bill as to polling at Parliamentary elections are to apply, with a few variations, to municipal elections, but not the provisions as to nominations.

Mr. Vernon Harcourt's bill for the amendment of the law as to registration of voters in boroughs is of course intended to carry out the same ideas as the bill which he introduced last year. It has, however, been very considerably altered, and is certainly on the whole much improved, so much so that it will require full consideration as a new measure. Care has, however, undoubtedly been bestowed upon the bill by someone, and the hints received from various sources have obviously been attended to. We gather, however, from the observations of Mr. Harcourt, in moving the second reading, that many of these improvements, as we think them, were carried in committee last year without his entire approval. Whatever the source of the alterations may be, we have reason to think that our own criticisms on the bill of last year have been considered, as most of our suggestions have been adopted. In particular, the great and leading fault of last year's bill—viz., the great length of time to be consumed in making a register according to its provisions, has been removed. Under the bill of last year, every election must have taken place upon a stale, and therefore necessarily inaccurate, register. By the bill of this year the time is shortened instead of lengthened, as we suggested might well be done. At present the time consumed is from the 31st of July to the 1st of January, an additional month having been added in 1867. By the proposed bill the time will only be from the 24th of June to the 1st of November. This is an obvious improvement; first, because the time is shorter; secondly, because one of the usual quarter days, from which tenancies are commonly commenced, is taken for the commencement; and, thirdly, because if, as is proposed, in boroughs which are both municipal and parliamentary the register is to include those entitled to vote at both elections, the month of November is the best month for the new register to come into force.

Although this bill has been much improved, it cannot be considered a perfect measure. It bears the appearance of being drawn by a person not himself practically acquainted with registration, who had adopted and made use of many suggestions of practical value which must undoubtedly have originated with persons conversant with the subject. The draftsman even now falls occasionally into errors, showing ignorance of practical points, which would be serious if the measure passed as it is, although there appear far fewer instances of this in this year's bill than there were in the last. The bill has already been read a second time, and the committee upon it has been appointed for the 27th of March. We shall probably be able to consider it carefully, and criticise its details before it is again discussed in Parliament.

The Public Prosecutors Bill of this year is backed by Mr. Spencer Walpole, as well as by Mr. Russell

Gurney, Mr. Vernon Harcourt, and the other gentlemen whose names were on the bill of last year. It is substantially the same as last year's bill. Several verbal amendments have been made. Thus, it is made clear that the counsel for public prosecutions are to be advising counsel only. This interpretation we put upon the bill of last year, although it was generally commented on as if all prosecutions were to be conducted by these counsel. The bill of this year contains but one new section adapting the present law as to restitution of stolen property after a prosecution by the owner, to the case of a prosecution by the public prosecutor. Our remarks upon the bill of last year (15 S. J. 398) are all applicable to the bill of this year except the verbal criticisms, the occasion for which has now been removed. Without pretending that the bill is perfect, it is good enough for us decidedly to wish it success.

BILLS OF SALE.

NO. I.

The amount of moveable chattels in the world increases every day; and, in this country at least, their aggregate value increases more rapidly than the aggregate value of land; we believe that the amount of money lent on the security of personal chattels is also daily increasing; we propose, therefore, to discuss shortly, from a conveyancing point of view, the principal questions that arise on mortgages of personal chattels.

There is a broad distinction between property held by title—such as land, where the fact of a man's being in possession does not raise even a *prima facie* presumption of his being the owner, or such as a *chose in action*, where no person can be strictly said to be in possession—and property such as personal chattels, where possession affords *prima facie* proof of ownership. No reasonable man believes that a person who occupies a house is necessarily the owner of it in fee simple; on the other hand, the presumption is very strong that the coat which a man wears belongs to him. There are some exceptional cases, where the possession of chattels affords no presumption of ownership; where the notorious custom of some particular trade is for one man to be in possession of another man's goods; but for the present, we will consider chattels of such a nature that the possession of them affords *prima facie* proof of ownership.

A mortgage of personal chattels can be made either without or by means of a deed; but we are confining ourselves to those cases where the mortgage is made by means of a deed (bill of sale).

In framing the deed our first difficulty arises from the fact that it is not intended to disturb the possession of the mortgagor, and that it therefore offends against the old rule, deduced either from the principles of the common law or from the statute 13 Eliz. c. 5, that unless possession accompanies and follows a bill of sale, it is void as against creditors (*Edwards v. Harben*, 2 T. R. 587). It is now, however, settled that the mere fact of the assignor remaining in possession does not necessarily render the bill of sale void, the test being the following—viz.: is the remaining in possession consistent with the terms of the deed and the nature of the transaction? or, as it has been put by Lord Eldon, "The mere circumstance of possession of chattels, however familiar it may be to say that it proves fraud, amounts to no more than that it is *prima facie* evidence of property in the man possessing, until a title not fraudulent is shown under which that possession followed." (*Lady Arundell v. Phipps*, 10 Ves. 145.) This dictum of Lord Eldon's exactly meets the case of a mortgage where the mortgagor is allowed to remain in possession, and accordingly, as a general rule, such a mortgage effected by bill of sale will be upheld although the mortgagor remains in possession, and that whether the deed contains a clause expressly authorising him to do so or not. (*Cook v. Walker*, 3 W. R. 357.) It is, however, the practice to insert a clause, which will require particular discussion,

authorising the mortgagor to take possession of the chattels, and declaring that till that is done the mortgagor shall remain in possession.

The next difficulty in framing the deed arises from the operation of the Bankruptcy Act, 1869, which provides that all goods and chattels being at the commencement of the bankruptcy in the possession, order, and disposition of the bankrupt, being a trader by the consent and permission of the true owner, of which goods and chattels the bankrupt is reputed owner, shall be divisible amongst his creditors.

If a bill of sale by way of mortgage contained the usual clause authorising the mortgagor to remain in possession so long as he performed all the covenants contained in it, he would be in possession according to the terms of the deed, and the chattels would not pass to his trustee in bankruptcy; while if he broke one of the covenants, and retained possession of the chattels, his possession would not be in accordance with the terms of the deed, and they would pass to his trustee in bankruptcy (*Ashton v. Blackshaw*, 18 W. R. 307, L. R. 9 Eq. 516).

Lastly, although the execution of the mortgage deed transfers the property to the mortgagee as against the mortgagor, it is necessary to perfect it by registration within 21 days under the 17 and 18 Vict. c. 36, the Bills of Sale Registration Act, otherwise it is void as against the trustee in bankruptcy of the mortgagor, the trustee under an assignment for the benefit of his creditors, and against his execution creditors.

It will be observed that we have to guard against the claims of two different persons, viz.—execution creditor and a trustee in bankruptcy or under an assignment for the benefit of creditors, and that unless the deed is registered under the Bills of Sale Registration Act, it is void against each of these persons—a phrase which, though constantly used, is misleading, and requires some explanation. When we turn to the Act itself, we find that an unregistered bill of sale is void after the expiration of twenty-one days from its date as against the trustee in bankruptcy, or under an assignment for the benefit of creditors, as against sheriff officers, and others actually seizing the property, and as against the person on whose behalf execution is levied, "so far as regards the property in or right to the possession of any personal chattels comprised in such bill of sale, which, at or after the time of such bankruptcy, or of the execution by the debtor of such assignment for the benefit of his creditors, or of executing such process (as the case may be), and after the expiration of the said period of twenty-one days, shall be in the possession or apparent possession of the person making such bill of sale, or of any person against whom the process shall have issued under or in the execution of which such bill of sale shall have been made or given, as the case may be."

A mortgage deed, where, as above pointed out, the possession of the chattels by the debtor is consistent with the terms of the deed, does not offend against the statute of Elizabeth, and can be perfected as against an execution creditor by registration, by which we mean that the chattels comprised in it cannot be taken in execution levied on behalf of a creditor of the mortgagor.

It might reasonably be asked whether the effect of a registered bill of sale is not to give notice to all the world that the chattels comprised in it are no longer the property of the person assigning them, and thus to take them out of his "order and disposition." It has, however, been settled that this is not the case (*Stansfield v. Cubitt*, 6 W. R. 320, 2 De G. & J. 222; *Ashton v. Blackshaw*, *ubi sup.*). And accordingly the chattels comprised in a registered bill of sale by way of mortgage will pass to the trustee in bankruptcy if the possession of the mortgagor is inconsistent with the terms of deed, as, for instance, if he is to remain in possession "till default," and he remains in possession after default.

Another very serious practical difficulty arises from the dread on the part of the mortgagor of its being known that he has executed a bill of sale, and accordingly, he often refuses to allow it to be registered, in which case, as has already been stated, it is void against his execution creditors, and, if he be a trader, against his trustee in bankruptcy. The following plans have been devised to avoid these difficulties, and although they are open to objection, it is as well that they should be mentioned. It has been decided that where the grantee under a bill of sale takes possession of the chattels comprised in it within the twenty-one days, there is no occasion to register (*Maples v. Hartley*, 9 W. R. 334, 7 Jur. N. S. 446; *Banbury v. White*, 11 W. R. 785; and see 2 Dav. Prec. 701), and that where several successive bills of sale are given for the same purpose, each of them operates as a fresh security, so that where the chattels comprised in the successive bills of sale were seized by an execution creditor, and the last of such bills of sale was subsequently registered within the twenty-one days, it prevailed against the execution creditor (*Hollingsworth v. White*, 10 W. R. 619). Cases have occurred in practice where a loan was to be made for a very short term, and where it was of the utmost importance that no suspicion should be raised as to the position of the mortgagor.

In such cases the plan resorted to has been the following: a mortgage by way of bill of sale was made in the usual form and executed, but it was not stamped. Before the expiration of the twenty-one days another copy of the deed was executed, with the necessary verbal alterations owing to the change of date; the same process was repeated until the loan was satisfied. If at any time it had become necessary to enforce the security, the current bill of sale would have been stamped and registered. There are two objections to this method—first, that it entails the expense of fresh engrossments of the bill of sale, and of their execution by the mortgagor, at every period not greater than twenty-one days during the whole time that the loan remains on foot; and second, that there is the considerable risk that owing to some accident the renewed bills of sale may not be executed within the successive periods of twenty-one days. It has been attempted to meet this latter difficulty by arranging with the mortgagor that he shall execute and hand over to the mortgagee new bills of sale at intervals not exceeding eighteen or nineteen days, so as to allow time for the stamping and registration of the current bill of sale on his failure to do so.

Since the decision in *Ex parte Cohen*, *Re Sparke* (20 W. R. 69, L. R. 7 Ch. 20), there is an objection to the plan of agreement for successive deeds being executed within the twenty-one days. In that case, Mellish, L.J., characterised such arrangements as mere fraudulent evasions of the Act. He expressly distinguished cases in which the arrangement was made for the benefit of the creditor (which he considered *bona fide*) from those in which the arrangement was intended for the benefit of the debtor, to avoid the publicity aimed at by the Act. It is true that in this case the bill of sale involved an entire *cessio bonorum*, but Lord Justice Mellish's principle is independent of that. It appears, however, that if no agreement for non-registration be made at the time when the bill of sale is executed, there is no objection to the creditor accepting a new bill of sale at the request of the debtor, instead of registering that which he has (*Hollingsworth v. White*, *ubi sup.*).

VANDALISM IN THE RECORD-OFFICE.—We regret to hear of a painful scandal in the Record-office. Some of the documents have been mutilated; yet the offence has been hitherto allowed to pass unpunished. Lord Romilly may have been influenced by reasons of which we know nothing; but some explanation is desirable, as the destruction of public documents is a matter that concerns the nation.—*Athenaeum*.

RECENT DECISIONS.

EQUITY.

PRACTICE—SECURITY FOR COSTS—CAUSE AND CROSS CAUSE—LIMITED COMPANY.

City of Moscow Gas Company v. International Financial Society M.R., 20 W. R. 196.

The 69th section of the Companies Act, 1862, enables the Court to require a plaintiff limited company to give security for costs, if it shall appear by any credible testimony that there is reason to believe that the assets of the company will be insufficient to pay the costs; and the security to be given in such cases is not confined to £100, but must be for an amount equal to the probable amount of costs payable (*Imperial Bank of China v. Bank of Hindustan*, 14 W. R. 811). It is a general rule, however, that the defendant in a cross suit shall not call upon the plaintiff in the cross suit to give security for costs; the principle being that the defendant by suing the plaintiff originally has admitted the jurisdiction, and cannot afterwards question it, but that a person who, though nominally a plaintiff, is actually a defendant, will be permitted freely to defend himself. It was held by the Lord Chancellor, when a Vice-Chancellor, in *Accidental and Marine Insurance Company v. Mercati* (15 W. R. 88, L. R. 3 Eq. 200), that the 69th section of the Companies Act, 1862, makes no alteration in this principle; and accordingly, where a limited company was plaintiff in a suit to set aside a policy on which the defendant was suing the company in an action at law, the Court refused to require the company to give security, although a petition to wind it up was pending at the time. It is obvious that a suit in defence of an action at law is to all intents and purposes a cross suit (*Watteau v. Billam*, 3 De G. & Sm. 516). The suit, however, must be strictly in the nature of a cross suit, or the defendant in it will not be deprived of the right to call for security (*Washoe Mining Company v. Ferguson*, 14 W. R. 820, and see *Macgregor v. Shaw*, 2 De G. & Sm. 360).

The power given by the 69th section is in terms wholly discretionary; and it will be seen that the Master of the Rolls thought that it might be exercised even in a cross suit. But according to the Vice-Chancellor in *Accidental Death Insurance Company v. Mercati* (sup.), the section must not be construed so as to put a new construction on the rule of the Court, or to vary the existing ordinary jurisdiction.

COMMON LAW.

COMPENSATION FOR LANDS INJURIOUSLY AFFECTED UNDER LANDS CLAUSES ACT, 1845.

Queen v. St. Luke's, Chelsea, Ex. Ch., 20 W. R. 209.

The decision of the Queen's Bench (reported 19 W. R. 1086, L. R. 6 Q. B. 572, commented on 15 S. J. 884) has been affirmed, but on somewhat different grounds. It will be remembered that, in order to establish their right to compensation for the "injuriously affecting" of their property (none of which had been taken by the defendants) the claimants were compelled to rely entirely on the Lands Clauses Act, 1845. The Court of Queen's Bench held that section 68, especially as interpreted by the light of section 22, gave by inference the right to compensation in such cases, although in form it only purported to regulate the means of redress of persons who were otherwise entitled. The Court of Exchequer Chamber has affirmed this decision, but instead of holding the right to be given by section 68, and only referring to section 22 by way of analogy, they appear to have declined to say what their decision would have been if section 68 alone had been incorporated, and to have founded their judgment rather on sections 22, 23, and 63, as well as on section 68. It is difficult to see why reliance should be placed on section 63, which plainly relates only to the case where lands are taken. But if it is once held (as it may well be)

that section 22 refers to damage, independently of land being taken, then, in fact, it becomes unnecessary to rely on the 68th, except for the purpose for which it was, no doubt, introduced—namely, to provide for the mode of proceeding in cases where, without any notice having been given by the company, land has been taken or damage done. The case is of great importance, as it decides for the first time what has often been asserted in text-books, but on no better ground than cases really governed by the Railway Clauses Act, 1845, ss. 6, 16, or similar clauses in other Acts.

SLANDER.—SPECIAL DAMAGE.

Davis v. Solomon, Q. B. 20 W. R. 167.

It is impossible not to regret that the declaration in this case was not less safe. The action was brought for a slanderous imputation of incontinence against a wife, alleging as special damage the loss of her husband's society, and the loss of her friends' hospitality. The latter allegation being framed so as to bring the case within *Moore v. Meagher*, 2 Taunt. 39, the declaration was good independently of the first; but the Court intimated that if the first had stood alone they would have taken time to consider, and appeared inclined to dissent from the opinion of Lord Wensleydale in *Lynch v. Knight*, 9 H. L. 577, that loss of the husband's consortium was not special damage which would support an action for slander of the wife. We do not propose here to discuss that question, but only call attention to the fact that the present case throws a further doubt on the correctness of that opinion.

"NEW STREET."

Pound v. Plumstead Board of Works, [Q. B., 20 W. R. 177.

This case decides that, although the word "street" includes by virtue of 18 & 19 Vict. c. 120, s. 250, and 25 & 26 Vict. c. 102, s. 112, all highways, yet an old highway already in existence at the time of the passing of the first Act, and therefore a street under it, and also under the second Act, may by the building of houses along its course be converted into a "new street" within section 112 of the latter Act. To have held the contrary would have been to cleave to the latter, in opposition to the obvious sense and meaning of the Act. The other point in the case, whether the owner of land which he had made into roads leading into the new street, was liable to contribute as an adjacent owner, involved so obscure a contention on his part that the Court did not appear to understand it; nor do we.

REVIEWS.

A Manual of the Law relating to Divorces and Matrimonial Causes; with a Chapter on the Married Women's Property Act, 1870. By ROBERT CULLEN DEWEY, Solicitor. London: Longmans.

This is a little volume based on a principle which we have often reproached, viz., that of combining the practitioner's text-book with the popular manual. "It seemed to the author," says the preface, "that there was room for a work like the present, which should be useful not only to professional, but to non-professional persons, and withal be of handy size and inexpensive." We believe that the legal and the popular are incompatible in book-making, and that attempts to combine them will mislead the lawyer by giving him too little, and confuse and betray the public by attempting to give them too much. But though in our opinion this little work is composed on an ill-advised principle, the execution appears very good. The subjects of divorce and judicial and voluntary separation are condensed into some 115 12mo pages, and the condensation is well done. The condition of authority on the numerous sub-divisions is represented to an extent of detail that is surprising, considering the great compression, and, what is more, a proper proportion or perspective is preserved throughout.

For the "Chapter on the Married Women's Property Act, 1870," we cannot say as much, since it comprises, in

effect, nothing more than a re-print of the Act, coupled with a warning that important questions are likely to arise on it, and that it requires very careful perusal. At this date a great many of the doubts open under the Act have been already raised in the county courts and elsewhere, and in a "Chapter on the Act" we should have expected to see these pointed out.

Lectures on Hindu Law, Delivered in 1871. By H. COWELL, Barrister-at-law, and Tagore Law Professor. Thacker & Co.

This is the second and concluding series of the lectures on Hindu Law delivered by Mr. Cowell, the Tagore Law Professor to the University of Calcutta. We noticed favourably the first series on a previous occasion (15 S. J. 578), and we are glad to be able to speak as favourably of the second series. There are five subjects dealt with in the course—Alienation, Partition, Succession, Wills and Contracts. The last, on account of the imminence of a contract code, is dealt with rather superficially, but the others are treated exhaustively. The most interesting chapters to the non-Indian lawyer are those which deal with Hindu wills. There is a conflict of opinion whether wills are indigenous to the Hindu law or are of English importation. Mr. Cowell inclines to the former and, as we think, the more correct supposition. It may be that a will was unknown to the Hindu law in its oldest form, but it was engrafted upon the Hindu law by Hindu lawyers, and not by English lawyers. But, granting that he can make a will, what is the extent of the testamentary power of a Hindu? This is discussed at great length by Mr. Cowell, and he winds up by adopting the *dictum* of the Privy Council that "the extent of the testamentary power of disposition by Hindus must be regulated by the Hindu law." This is independent of the recent "Hindu Wills Act," which has made certain sections of the Indian Succession Act, 1865, applicable to the wills of Hindus, Jains, Sikhs, and Buddhists in the lower provinces of Bengal, and in the towns of Madras and Bombay. This Act, it will be observed, does not apply to the whole of India, nor of course does it apply to wills made before its date. But it introduces this change, that whereas no signature or other formality is required for a will by the Hindu law, wills to which the Act applies must be executed and attested in manner provided by the Succession Act, which follows, with a slight variation, the English law.

The Code of Civil Procedure. By ANGELO J. LEWIS, Barrister-at-law. W. H. Allen & Co.

This is the second of a series of Indian law manuals which Mr. Angelo Lewis contemplates giving to the world. We noticed the first of the series (14 S. J. 629), but not in very favourable terms, and we regret that our verdict on the second must be similar to our verdict on the first. In this manual of the Civil Code Mr. Lewis "adheres with undiminished faith to the system of question and answer;" but instead of using his own language in the answers, as in the previous manual, he uses the language of the Code. So far this is an undoubted gain, as Mr. Lewis's own language is not very accurate. The "carefully prepared abstract prefixed" to the text of the Code is extremely inaccurate as an abstract. The plan of taking one or more sections of the Code, and using them as a reply to a question founded on them, is a task which any solicitor's clerk of average ability could have discharged quite as well as Mr. Lewis. The only pretensions to authorship in the work are introduced in the Notes, and of these—in spite of the way in which Mr. J. B. Bell and Mr. R. V. Doyne are dragged in by the heels and made indirectly responsible for a portion thereof—we should not think very much, even if they were not open, as they are, to charges of incorrectness. Thus, in a note at page 74, we find it laid down that the Law of Limitation, "prevailing in India, is now governed by Act ix. of 1871 replacing Act xiv. of 1859," whereas in reality the Act of 1871 will not replace the Act of 1859 for years to come, inasmuch as it is provided by the former Act that it is not to apply to suits instituted before the 1st of April, 1873.

Games, Gaming and Gamster's Law. By FREDERICK BRANDY, of the Inner Temple, Barrister-at-law. London: Sweet.

The author of this work seems to be fond of legal oddities, since he once published a work on the legal relations

of pugilism. The little volume now before us is of a "popular" cast. To a quantity of gossiping information about old English gamings and gamsters, of the kind which might be got up from Hone's Every-day Book or Chambers' Book of Days, it adds a few antiquarian oddities of the subject, culled from the old law reports, and the topic is carried down to the recent statutes and the well-known "betting-machine" case of *Tollett v. Thomas*, 19 W. R. 890, L. R. 6 Q. B. 514. Of course there are a good many amusing things in the book, e.g., the account of the old case of *Harris v. Bowden*, Cro. Eliz. 90, where plaintiff brought his action on the case for that defendant had enticed him to play at dice, and won, and obtained £46 6s. 8d. of him, plaintiff using "*quosdam talos veraciter titulos*," while defendant threw with "*quosdam alios talos falsos et subdole titulos quos numeros quinque vel novem aliquo jactu unquam attingere scivisset adhuc et ibidem projecit*." Plea "not guilty," and verdict having been found for plaintiff, exceptions taken in arrest of judgment—1. "That the word *talos* was no word for dice; *sed non allocatur* for it is a proper word for dice." 2. "That the word *lucisset* was written with a *c* (*lucisset*), which is for shining; but the record was viewed, and it was written with an *s*, and the plaintiff had judgment;"—a very remarkable instance of the abominations of technicalities under which our forefathers groaned. Bowden must, one would think, have instructed his lawyer to gain him time by dilatory pleas, till he should have had time to abscond or defeat the ends of justice. There are, as we have said, some amusing things in this book; but it is flimsy, and too garrulous in style.

COURTS.

COURT OF CHANCERY.

Vice-Chancellor Malins will for the present take adjourned summonses on Saturdays and Mondays, and causes only on Tuesdays and Wednesdays.

QUEEN'S BENCH.

(At Nisi Prius, before LUSH, J., and a Special Jury.)

Feb. 6.—*Moore v. The Metropolitan Railway Company.*

False imprisonment—Liability of a railway company for the wrongful acts of their servant.

A passenger on the defendant's line, having proceeded to a station beyond that to which he was booked, was arrested by a railway official, and charged before a magistrate and acquitted. In an action brought by the passenger against the company for false imprisonment—Held, that the company were not liable for the wrongful act of their servant, unless he had acted according to instructions expressly given him by the company (8 & 9 Vict. c. 20, ss. 103—4).

This was an action for false imprisonment brought by the plaintiff against the defendants, under the following circumstances. In August last the plaintiff took a return ticket from the Notting-hill Station to the Mansion-house by the defendants' line. On returning from the city he travelled from Moorgate-street and alighted at the Edgware-road Station. He then gave up the half of the ticket for the return journey, to the ticket collector, who demanded twopence, as excess fare. The plaintiff asserted his right to travel between those intermediate stations with the same ticket, but offered to pay, under protest, the sum demanded, if a receipt were given him. This was refused, and the ticket collector, acting under the advice of the station inspector, a railway official, caused the defendant to be taken to a police-station, and charged, under 8 & 9 Vict. c. 20, s. 103—4, with travelling to a greater distance than that for which his ticket was available, and with intent to defraud.

The magistrate dismissed the charge, and the plaintiff accordingly brought this action.

The plaintiff deposed to the above facts, and also that he had been informed at Notting-hill Station, by the station-master, prior to taking his ticket, that he could travel by the route in question.

Wood and Lewis Glyn, for the plaintiff.

M. Chambers, Q.C., and Day, Q.C., for the defendants.

It was contended, for the defendants, that there should be a nonsuit, as the company were not shown to have given their servant instructions to apprehend any person for the

offence in question; and that proof of this fact was essential to establish the plaintiff's right to recover.

The plaintiff's counsel argued, on the other hand, that as 8 & 9 Vict. c. 120, ss. 123-4, gave the servants of the company power to arrest any person offending against those sections, the defendants should be taken to have given the instructions necessary for them to take advantage of the Act of Parliament. They cited *Goff v. The Great Western Railway Company*, 30 L. J. Q. B. 143, and *Poulton v. The London and South Western Railway Company*, L. R. 2 Q. B. 538.

LUSH, J., was of opinion that the Railway Clauses Consolidation Act did not authorise an inspector to give a person into custody under such circumstances as had been detailed, and that consequently there being no evidence to show that the inspector had been expressly instructed by the company in the matter, the defendants could not be held responsible for the wrongful act of their servant. He therefore directed a nonsuit.

COURT OF BANKRUPTCY.

LINCOLNS-INN-FIELDS.

(Before Mr. Registrar ROCHE, acting as Chief Judge.)

Feb. 12.—*Re Davis.*

Injunction granted under the Bankruptcy Act, 1869, to restrain proceedings under a petition of right, presented by a bankrupt against the Lords Commissioners of Admiralty, with a view to the recovery of salvage money properly claimed by his assignees.

This was an application on behalf of the Lords Commissioners of the Admiralty to restrain proceedings under a petition of right presented by Marcus Davis. The facts were, that so long since as 1863, James Nathaniel Loveridge, assistant engineer of Her Majesty's ship *Trident*, assigned to Davis his share of any prize-money, &c., arising or to arise out of the capture, &c., of any pirates, slave-ships, &c. In November, 1868, Davis became bankrupt, but he challenged the adjudication and presented a petition to annul, which, however, was dismissed by Mr. Commissioner Holroyd, and the Lords Justices upheld that decision. Loveridge, it appeared, had recently become entitled, as an officer of the *Trident*, to a share in respect of certain salvage services rendered to a merchant vessel called the *Agnes*, of Liverpool, and Davis, as his assignee, claimed the money, and had presented a petition of right to Her Majesty with a view to obtain payment. In this petition he disclosed the fact of the adjudication, but stated that he disputed its validity. The Lords Commissioners had not pleaded.

Huddleston, Q.C., and J. O. Griffiths, in support of the application:—In this case the Lords Commissioners are in this difficulty: that the money is claimed by the bankrupt, and also by the assignees, and we ask the Court to determine the rights of the parties, and that an injunction should issue. That the Court has jurisdiction even in a case under the old law, is clear from *Ex parte Wood, Re Taylor & Rumbold*, 19 W. R. 601, affirmed on appeal *sub nom Ex parte Rumbold*, *ib.* 162; *Ex parte Anderson*, 18 W. R. 1124; L. R. 5 Ch. 473, is also an authority in support of the application.

[Mr. Registrar ROCHE.—It is unfortunate that the bankruptcy was not pleaded, and the authorities show that there is a discretion in the Court to grant or refuse an injunction.]

The bankrupt seeks to try the validity of his bankruptcy at the expense of Government, and this we object to.

Mr. Munns, solicitor for the assignees:—We claim this money as part of the bankrupt's estate, and as the bankrupt, on the 20th of October, 1868, actually surrendered to the adjudication, he cannot now impeach the validity of the proceedings. We are prepared to give any indemnity.

Mr. Registrar ROCHE.—*Prima facie*, the bankrupt in this case is *civiler mortuus*, and he has no capacity to deal with any portion of his assets. But I cannot help thinking that the Lords Commissioners of the Admiralty ought to have pleaded the fact of the claimant being an undischarged bankrupt, in bar to the petition of right. As the assignees now appear, and state that they claim this sum as a portion of the bankrupt's estate, the motion will stand over in order that they may give proper notice. If they make out such a case as will entitle them to payment, I shall grant an injunction, which I have clearly jurisdiction to do.

Solicitor to the Admiralty, *Bristow*.

Solicitors for the assignees, *Lewis, Munns & Co.*

(Before Mr. Registrar MURRAY, acting as Chief Judge.)

Feb. 14.—*Re Adler.*

Sale by private contract directed in a case where the two trustees differed on the subject.

Horace Browne, on behalf of the trustees, under a petition for liquidation filed by the debtor, applied for the direction of the Court under these circumstances:—

At a meeting of creditors held under the petition on the 2nd of February, it was arranged that the affairs of the debtor should be liquidated by arrangement, and not in bankruptcy, and two trustees, Messrs. Thorpe and Nicholson, were appointed. A day or two afterwards, a purchaser (Mr. Werner) was found for the debtor's stock-in-trade, and Mr. Thorpe consented to a sale for £40. Mr. Nicholson, the other trustee, was of opinion, however, that the price was inadequate, and he insisted upon a sale by auction. Mr. Thorpe still desired to adhere to the original arrangement, and he had filed an affidavit, stating that the property would not realise more than £40. On behalf of Mr. Nicholson, no affidavit was filed, but he expressed his willingness to abide by any order which the Court might make.

Browne cited the 72nd section of the Bankruptcy Act, 1869.

Mr. Registrar MURRAY.—By the 6th sub-section of the 25th section, it is provided that the trustee shall have power "to sell all the property of the bankrupt (including the goodwill of the business, if any, and the book debts due or growing due to the bankrupt) by public auction or private contract," &c. I do not wish to establish a precedent which may lead to great expense if trustees are to come here if they disagree, for the costs may be thrown upon the trustee, who without sufficient reason dissents from the course intended to be adopted by his co-trustee. All I can do here, as there is no evidence that the property is likely to realise more by forced sale, is to order that the trustees be at liberty to carry into effect the contract made with Mr. Werner.

Solicitor, *T. W. Bilton.*

APPOINTMENTS.

Mr. PETER HENRY EDLIN, Q.C., of the Western Circuit, has been appointed by the Home Secretary, recorder of the borough of Bridgwater, in Somersetshire, which office had become vacant by the death of Mr. E. H. Reed, barrister-at-law. Mr. Edlin was called to the Bar at the Middle Temple in June, 1847, and joined the Western Circuit, attending also the Bristol and Somerset sessions. He was created a Queen's Counsel in 1869.

Mr. CHARLES WALTER CAMPION, barrister-at-law, has been appointed secretary to the Right Hon. H. B. W. Brand, the newly-elected Speaker of the House of Commons, who has succeeded the Right Hon. J. E. Denison, (now Viscount Ossington) in that office. Mr. Campion is a younger son of W. J. Campion, Esq., of Danny-park, Sussex, by his marriage with Harriet, daughter of the late Thomas Read Kemp, Esq., of Kemp Town, Brighton. He was educated at Balliol College, Oxford, where he graduated B.A. in 1863. He was called to the Bar at Lincoln's-inn in January, 1866, and has been a member of the Home Circuit, practising also at the Sussex sessions. The salary of the Speaker's secretary is £500 per annum.

Mr. JOHN DAVIES DAVENPORT, Barrister-at-law, has been appointed secretary to the Winchester School Commission. Mr. Davenport was of Balliol College, Oxford. He gained more than one university scholarship, including, in 1863, Johnson's mathematical scholarship. He was subsequently elected to the Hidden fellowship at Brasenose, was called to the Bar at Lincoln's-inn in April, 1866, and has practised at the Equity bar.

Mr. NICHOLAS DONNITHORNE, solicitor, Fareham, has been appointed clerk to the justices for the Fareham division of the county of Hants, and to the Fareham Petty Sessional Bench. He has also been appointed clerk to the Commissioners of Taxes and Inhabited House Duties, and clerk to the Company of Proprietors of Bursledon-bridges and roads on the resignation of those appointments by his late partner, Mr. Thomas John Provis. Mr. Donnithorne, who was certificated in 1871, is a Commissioner for Affidavits.

Mr. ALFRED RICKETTS HUDSON, solicitor, of Pershore, Worcestershire, has been appointed (by Col. H. S. Scobell, the High Sheriff for 1872) to be Under-sheriff for the county of Worcester, for the current year. The business of the shrievalty will still be transacted at the office of Messrs. Gillam & Son, solicitors, of Worcester. This is the third time that Mr. Hudson has, at various intervals, filled the appointment of under-sheriff. He was admitted in 1849, and fills the offices of clerk to the commissioners of taxes for the Pershore district, and registrar of the Pershore County Court.

Mr. FROEN, of Lincoln's-inn, is appointed secretary to a committee to investigate a portion of the American claims under the Treaty of Washington.

PARLIAMENT AND LEGISLATION.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

Feb. 12.—*Burial Grounds Bill.*—Lord Beauchamp moved the second reading of this bill; it was, he said, identical with that of last session, which reached the Commons too late to become law. It would give to Dissenters equal facilities for the acquirement of land for burial-grounds to those now possessed by the members of the Established Church. It also provided for the burial of persons in graves belonging to their ancestors, without the performance of the Church of England Burial Service, where the persons themselves had left a written request that such service should not be performed, or where their representatives desired to dispense with it.—The Bishops of London and Winchester stated their approval of the bill, and the motion was agreed to.

Feb. 13.—*The late Speaker of the House of Commons.*—The Right Hon. John Evelyn Denison, late Speaker of the House of Commons, took his seat as Viscount Ossington.

The "*Alabama*" Claims.—Lord Redesdale asked the Secretary for Foreign Affairs whether, if A. and B. in partnership sue C. in a court of law for injury done to their firm by fraud or otherwise, and C. pleads and proves that B. was acting with him in all the matters complained of, such plea would not be a complete answer to the suit, and render any recovery of damages impossible? Why a plea which is good in law and which common sense pronounces to be just has not been considered by Her Majesty's Government applicable to a new case in international law, and urged against the Alabama claims made on this country by the United States of America, in which the North and South are now partners, inasmuch as all the acts for which this country is charged with being culpably responsible were done by the South, and the partner now joins in the application to be paid for having done them?—Lord Granville claimed to be excused answering, especially without fee, law questions on hypothetical cases. However, as he had promised last session, he had brought the point raised by Lord Redesdale before those who had to advise on the arguments to be employed in the case.

Feb. 15.—*Sir R. Collier's Appointment.*—Earl Stanhope moved, "That this House has seen with regret the course taken by the Government in carrying out the provisions of the Act of last session relative to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, and is of opinion that the elevation of Sir Robert Collier to the Bench of the Court of Common Pleas and his transfer to the Judicial Committee were acts at variance with the spirit and intention of the statute, and of evil example in the exercise of judicial patronage." He recapitulated the statute and its history, the condemnation of the appointment by the Lord Chief Justice, as well as by the bar and legal profession as a body. The "hasty letter" of Mr. Justice Willes would not add to the reputation of that distinguished man, even in the opinion of his warmest friends. He commented on the Lord Chancellor's discourtesy towards the Lord Chief Justice, and his shrinking from meeting at once the charge brought against the Government. But he could refer to the Chancellor's own opinion of conduct such as his own had been in the matter. When the Lord Chancellor attended last year for examination before the Committee on Public Accounts, a question having been raised about the payment of clerks in the Report Office, it appeared that the exact letter of the 18 & 19 Vict. c. 134, s. 12, was observed by giving to the messengers the title of assistant clerks; and the Right Hon. G. W. Hunt having suggested

that the alteration in the title was made in order to enable provisions of the Act to be observed to the letter, the Lord Chancellor replied, "The suggestion is an imputation of a very gross abuse, for which I should deserve to be impeached, namely, observing the letter of an Act of Parliament, and breaking in every way the spirit of Act." In conclusion, he appealed to their Lordships, as unfettered by hustings pledges and party coercion, to vindicate their independence as an hereditary chamber.—Lord Portman said Lord Stanhope had condemned before hearing the evidence. Speaking as one bound by no party ties, he deprecated such hasty condemnation. Opinions were not unanimous, witness that of Mr. Justice Willes. But even if there had been an error of judgment, or a misinterpretation of the law, was that a matter for grave parliamentary censure? He compared the case to the technical "evasion" of a *conseil d'élire*, an acceptance of the Chiltern Hundreds, or a newly appointed judge passing the degree of the *coif per saltum*. He moved an amendment counter to the motion.—Lord Salisbury answered the charge of condemning the Lord Chancellor unheard, by referring to the Chancellors obstinate silence, in spite of the Lord Chief Justice's letters; all had been desiring only to hear the Lord Chancellor's defence. And now they were not asked to declare the Lord Chancellor blameless, but asked to say that in consequence of his high character he should escape censure, and that in consequence of a speech made to Lord Portman in the Lord Chancellor's private room. The appointment was a colourable evasion of the law; the Ewelme Rectory case showed the same disposition, and a stop must be put to a practice destructive of the confidence between the Legislature and the Executive. It was an advantage in one sense that votes of censure in that House did not entail the resignation of the Ministry, because it enabled the House to visit acts like the present with heavy censure without taking the machinery of Government to pieces at a moment when it was most undesirable to do so. He concluded by severely censuring the appointments of Mr. Beales and Mr. Homersham Cox; it became their Lordships as the highest Court of Judicature to prevent these things from being done by branding them with their displeasure.—The Duke of Argyll hotly defended the Lord Chancellor, and on the other hand characterised the Lord Justice's letter as "a railing accusation, almost a ribald accusation, against the Government." The Government had placed upon the Judicial Committee a lawyer who was eminently fit, and they did nothing but give a formal qualification to one who had already the substantial qualification which Sir R. Collier must be presumed, as the Attorney-General, to possess. The Government had not, therefore, violated the spirit, meaning, or intention of the statute. This was a party motion and nothing else.—Lord Westbury said it seemed as if the weakness of the Lord Chancellor's case were to be covered by unjustifiable abuse of the Lord Chief Justice. Warmly defending the course taken by the latter, he asked whether, upon any subject, there had been such unanimity of condemnation. He would regard this as a decree coming up from the Lord Chancellor, upon which it was his duty to sit on appeal, and in which it would be his duty to reverse the Lord Chancellor's judgment. Doubtless it was an error in judgment, nothing more, and he did not suppose the Government had been influenced by any unworthy motives. If this were a matter of private property, the act might be impeached as a fraudulent exercise of a power, and the Lord Chancellor, if it came before him, would be compelled to set it aside as a fraudulent abuse of the power. The appointment of Sir R. Collier, if before a court of equity, must be revoked. If, however, it were in fact irrevocable, their Lordships must do what they could to prevent gross abuses in future of powers given for one purpose and employed for another. He criticised the letter of Mr. Justice Willes, and protested against the Head of the Law justifying his conduct by the parsimony of the Chancellor of the Exchequer.—Lord Romilly said the appointment had been perfectly right and proper. The object of the Act was to get fit persons for the judicial committee, and if the Government had taken any other course they would have sacrificed the real meaning of the Act to a mere technicality.—The Lord Chancellor satirised the Lord Chief Justice's letter, which in his opinion was not one to be answered. It was no business of the Lord Chief Justice to interfere with politics, and so Lord Ellenborough had said. Yet these party motions and attacks were all founded upon the Lord Chief Justice's letter.—Lord Cranworth said he did not know what was meant by "the spirit of

an Act." No one disputed that Sir R. Collier was admirably fitted to be appointed a member of the Judicial Committee. After entering upon an elaborate investigation of the intention of the Act, he described the applications made to the existing judges of the superior courts to accept seats in the new tribunal. Two refused, owing to the absence of a provision for their clerks, and others appeared to be averse from acceptance. The Premier then expressed a doubt whether it was desirable to go on hawking about these appointments, and thus Sir R. Collier had consented to take the leaveings of the other judges. It was a gross misapprehension, then, to call this a colourable qualification. In conclusion he defended his appointments of Mr. Beales and Mr. Homersham Cox. He said "that of Mr. Beales occurred two and a-half years ago. (Cheers.) At that time no complaint of his appointment was made in this or the other House, or in the press, except anonymously; but I admit that in private, one illustrious person did take exception to the appointment. I am now glad of the opportunity of saying that if there is one thing in my career I rejoice in and recollect with happiness and pleasure, it is that I did justice to an honest and excellent man. (Cries of "Oh, oh," and "No.") I have known him from the time he was at college. He was deprived of an income of £700 or £800 a-year because he attended that meeting to which reference has been made, and deprived of it on the ground that, being a revising barrister, he might be suspected of partiality. He had held that office six years, and nobody had ever complained of his conduct; only one of his decisions had been reversed, and that upon a technical point. For the post of which he was deprived he had abandoned business in the Court of Chancery, which he always discharged well. The deprivation of office reduced him to ruin; and I thought it only right and just, as he had been so reduced to ruin for an expression of political opinion, that he should be restored to competence. When I am doing justice to myself I insist on being heard, and still more shall I insist on being heard when I am doing justice to another. Mr. Beales had been called upon by Mr. Walpole to assist him in removing difficulties which had arisen under steps that he advised. I have heard from a strongly Conservative clergyman near Wisbeach that two strongly Conservative solicitors at Wisbeach told him a month or two ago that they had been prejudiced against the appointment when it was made, but they now declared that they had never had so good, so well-informed, so assiduous and so honest a county court judge. The Government were in no way responsible for that particular appointment. From the first moment I held the Scales I resolved that I would do that man justice, and I have done it. The other case fished up shows what a party move this is." After briefly adverting to the appointment of Mr. Homersham Cox, the Lord Chancellor proceeded to say that four out of the seven equity judges agreed with himself as to the Collier appointment. In conclusion, he passionately defended the honesty of his own conduct.—Lord Cairns said the spirit and essence of the Act had been palpably violated. He was surprised to hear that the judgment of Parliament was not to be passed until the Lord Chancellor had given his explanation. Had he been desirous to explain, he might have done so on the motion for papers. The fitness of Sir R. Collier was not in question. After replying to some of the arguments used by previous speakers, he reverted to the history of the Act. He agreed in the only proposition laid down in Mr. Justice Willes' letter, that the appointment was legal. If it had not been legal Sir R. Collier could not have taken his seat. But the question was whether Sir R. Collier was chosen by the Prime Minister as a member of the Judicial Committee because he was a judge, or whether he was made a judge because he had already been chosen a member of the Judicial Committee. He was appointed a puisne judge on November 7, while on November 3 he was sworn a member of the Privy Council. Never before had a puisne judge been made a Privy Councillor before he took his seat on the bench. He inferred, therefore, that Sir R. Collier was made a Privy Councillor not with a view to the judgeship, but to the Judicial Committee, and that when the Prime Minister made his choice he selected one who was not one of the judges of the land when his mental choice was made. The essence of the Act was, therefore, practically violated. He honoured Lord Chief Justice Cockburn for the courage he had displayed, and protested against the doctrines heard from the Ministerial benches in defence of this appointment.—

Lord Granville said the Lord Chancellor's speech must have convinced all unprejudiced persons, and Lord Cairns had not in the slightest degree shaken the statement made. The matter lay in a nutshell; all now admitted the appointment to have been legal. On a division, the vote of censure was rejected by 89 to 87.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Feb. 9.—*The New Speaker*.—On the motion of Sir R. Palmer, seconded by Mr. Locke King, the Right. Hon. Henry Wm. Bouvier Brand took the chair as Speaker.

Feb. 12.—*The Royal Parks and Gardens Bill*.—The second reading, having been moved by Mr. Ayrton, was opposed by Mr. Vernon Harcourt, who objected to the summary powers of arrest given to park-keepers, and to the ranger's power of making arbitrary regulations.—Mr. Beresford Hope said the bill only enacted the same restrictions for the protection of the Royal parks as already prevailed in all town parks. Colonel Hogg, as Chairman of the Metropolitan Board of Works, bore testimony to the necessity for some regulations.—Lord J. Manners, Mr. Milford, and Mr. Baillie Cochrane also supported the second reading.—Mr. Henley, Mr. Denison, Mr. White, and Mr. Alderman Lawrence, opposed the bill, as restricting the enjoyment of the parks by the lower classes.—Mr. Ayrton said the sole object was to protect against the violence of the roughs. The bill would not put an end to the right of public meeting in the parks, it would subject it to regulation, and no regulations made by the ranger would be valid until they received the assent of the First Commissioner.—Second reading carried by 183 to 36.

Mines Regulation.—Mr. Bruce's bill (which is not the same as last year's bill) was read the first time, as also a bill for regulation of metalliferous mines.

Capital Punishment Abolition.—Mr. C. Gilpin's annual bill was read a first time.

Feb. 13.—*Railway Amalgamation Bills*.—In reply to Colonel Wilson Patten, Mr. Chichester Fortescue said the Government did not think it advisable to leave these bills to take the ordinary course, but purposed submitting them to a preliminary inquiry, especially with regard to the public interests involved in these great amalgamations, to see how the interests of the public could be best protected.

Contagious Diseases Bill.—Mr. Bruce introduced a bill, which he regretted as a retrograde step; it would substitute for the present Acts certain general stringent provisions for clearing the streets and preserving decency, for detaining diseased persons in custody for other offences, for the more effectual protection of young girls and women, and for repressing disorderly houses and the harbouring of diseased women. The advantages of the Acts were overbalanced by the agitation which had been carried on, its flagrant exaggerations and misrepresentations, and the distressing spectacle of female modesty broken through by taking part in these discussions. He hoped that the operation of the bill would create a fund of experience which would lead to the establishment of efficient means of repression.

Payment of Justices' Clerks.—Sir D. Salomons introduced a bill to improve the administration of Justice at Petty Sessions, by providing for payment of justices' clerks by salary.

Feb. 14.—*The Burials Bill*.—Mr. O. Morgan, in moving the second reading, dwelt on the grievances of Dissenters.—Mr. Birley opposed the bill; it was a stepping-stone to something worse, and there was no real grievance.—After a lengthy debate, in which the bill was supported by Messrs. Miall, Morley, Walter, H. Palmer, M^r. Arthur, and Young; and opposed by Messrs. Mowbray, Beresford Hope, Cubitt, F. Powell, and Colonel Barttelot; the second reading was carried by 179 to 108.

The Registration of Borough Voters Bill was read a second time.

Feb. 15.—*The Ballot Bill*.—On the order for the second reading, the rejection of the bill was moved by Mr. Liddell.—After a long debate upon the political aspect of the matter, the second reading was carried by 109 to 51.

The Corrupt Practices Bill was also read a second time.

Mr. James K. Blair, who has been one of the judges of the Liverpool County Court (Circuit No. 6) since October 1857, has tendered his resignation owing to failing health.

SOCIETIES AND INSTITUTIONS.

LEGAL EDUCATION ASSOCIATION.

At a meeting of the Executive Committee, held yesterday, at the rooms of the Judicial Society in St. Martin's-place, present: Sir Roundell Palmer, Q.C., M.P., in the chair; Messrs. Aldridge, Bryce, Clabon (Treasurer), Cobb, Francis, Janson, Longbourne (Hon. Sec.), Senior Wilberforce, Williams (Hon. Sec.), &c., &c.

The result of the deputation from the association to the Prime Minister was communicated to the committee, and arrangements were made for supporting the resolutions to be moved by Sir Roundell Palmer in the House of Commons on the 1st of March.

The following leading solicitors in various parts of the country were elected members of the council, namely, Messrs. Davenport, of Oxford; Smith, of Truro; Oldman, of Gainsborough; Wightwick, of Canterbury; Pearce, of Bedford; Simpson, of Derby; Radcliffe, of Plymouth; Ford, of Exeter; Ellis, of Sunderland; Gepp, of Chelmsford; Winterbotham, of Cheltenham; Blandy, of Reading; Pearce, of Southampton; Lee, of Winchester; Winterbotham, of Stroud; Bodenham, of Hereford; Tindal, of Aylesbury; Longmore, of Hertford; Maule, of Huntingdon; Monckton, of Maidstone; Reeve, of Leicester; Chamberlain, of Yarmouth; Markham, of Northampton; Sanderson, of Berwick-on-Tweed; Dees, of Newcastle-on-Tyne; Gibson, of Newcastle-on-Tyne; Enfield, of Nottingham; Davies, of Haverfordwest; Williams, of Rhyl; Peale, of Shrewsbury; Josselyn, of Ipswich; Greene, of Bury St. Edmunds; Smallpiece, of Guildford; Howlett, of Brighton; Harrison, of Kendal; Meek, of Devizes; Crust, of Beverley; Tomlin, of Richmond (Yorks); Buchanan, of Whitby; Walker, of York; Saul, of Carlisle; Phillips, of Stamford; Croome, of Caincross; and Turnley, of Bedford.

It was mentioned by the secretary that the petition in support of Sir Roundell Palmer's resolutions, which was in course of signature by solicitors practising in the county of Middlesex and the City of London, had, as far as could be ascertained, been signed by about 1,500 solicitors; and that similar petitions had been signed by upwards of 2,000 solicitors in various other counties (exclusive of the counties of Stafford, Warwick, Chester, and Lancaster), the progress in the last four counties not being stated, owing to the unavoidable absence of the gentlemen by whom they are being canvassed.

It was also mentioned that the following petitions had been sent to the following members of Parliament for presentation to the House of Commons:—To Sir Roundell Palmer; petitions from the solicitors practising in Oxfordshire, Berwick-on-Tweed, Shaftesbury, Ormskirk, Wigan, Burnley, Northwich, and Middlewich. To Mr. Hornby; a petition from the solicitors practising at Blackburn; and to Sir E. M. Buller, a petition from the solicitors practising in Congleton.

LAW LIFE ASSURANCE SOCIETY.

The annual meeting of the proprietors of this society was held on the 2nd inst., at the offices, Fleet-street. Mr. John Young presided.

Mr. GRIFFITH DAVIES (the actuary) read the notice convening the meeting, and also the report and statement of accounts.

The CHAIRMAN then moved that the latter be received and adopted. In asking their concurrence in this resolution, he really felt the great difficulty to be that there was so little new information which he could give them which had not already appeared in the report. Notwithstanding this, and although he had no desire to go over beaten ground, he should trouble them with a few words, and a few words only. It had been said that "happy is the country which has no history;" parodying the phrase, he might say happy is the insurance office which has no very serious tale to tell. Their tale, so far as it went, was one upon which he considered they might reasonably congratulate themselves. He had before him, in a condensed and concise form, a comparative statement of the operations of the society during the years 1870 and 1871, to which he would shortly refer. In the year 1870 the society effected 236 new insurances; in the year 1871 there was a slight falling off in this respect—only four, however—232 new policies having been effected during the past year. On the other

hand, the sum insured by the larger number of policies was £255,000 in the year 1870; while the sum insured in 1871 was £264,000,—thus being £9,000 more insured by the smaller number than in 1870. The new premiums in 1870 amounted to £10,000, and, in 1871, to £8,700; but this diminution is explained by the fact that the lives during the past year were for the most part younger lives. He need scarcely inform them that there would necessarily be, in transactions of a great society like this, fluctuations from year to year; on the whole, however, they might feel satisfied with the circumstance that they had an even and steady flow of business. In the year 1870 the renewal premiums were £260,982; in the year 1871, £267,832; thus indicating a difference in favour of the former year of £3,150, but this did not substantially affect the position of the society. On the profit and loss account of the insurance fund they had in 1870 £192,473, and, in 1871, £194,308—the increase in the past year amounting to £1,835. In respect to the guarantee fund, the income was in 1870 £42,250, and, in 1871, £42,116; here there was constantly a change of investment, but, as would be perceived, the difference in the two years was altogether immaterial. There would be, as he had before mentioned, always these little fluctuations in their business. Proceeding with his statistical quotations, he then stated that the total income for 1870 on both accounts amounted to £506,341, and, in 1871, to £503,029; there being here again a slight difference, but from such fluctuations as these they were not warranted in drawing any inference in depreciation of the prosperity of the society. Their total assets had increased by nearly £10,000, the amount being in 1870 £5,459,509, and, in 1871, £5,469,168. In 1870 the claims stood thus:—Sums assured £255,834, with bonuses amounting to £125,401; while in 1871 the claims were £280,688, with bonuses amounting to £127,356, showing a total in 1870 of £381,235, against, in 1871, £408,044. While upon this subject, he would take the opportunity of calling their attention to one or two simple though important facts with reference to the position of the society. They had been in existence at the present time something under half a century—the period being forty-eight years—and during that time they had paid over the counter, if he might use the phrase, between nine and ten millions sterling; and they had now upwards of five millions of invested assets, with an annual income of £503,000. These figures were really of a startling amount and significance, and showed a degree of prosperity with which both proprietors and assured had reason to be well satisfied. With respect to any apparent falling off that might be noticed, they must remember that the past year or year and a half had been most disastrous in the history of insurance societies. They had seen the collapse of more than one apparently flourishing office, which affected to carry on a large and successful business. It was probable that these great failures would produce in the minds of certain sections of society an impression that insurance offices were not to be trusted. The effect upon the minds of that class of persons who had with considerable difficulty saved some provision for their wife and children of a total loss of their hard earnings, might easily be imagined, and thus a sort of distrust was engendered in life assurance; but he was of opinion that the final result would be that people would consider it best to go to some well and substantially established society. He believed, indeed, that before long they would find the reaction in favour of offices like theirs, which would be prepared to give to the public material guarantees of their perfect trustworthiness. There were one or two other points which had been adverted to in the report, and one was the sale of their Irish estates. This was an important feature in the report, and it would be satisfactory to the proprietors to know that—assuming the purchase to be completed, of which there was little doubt—they would be placed exactly in the position in which they stood when they originally lent their money to the late Mr. Martin, of Galway. The society would not have sustained a single shilling of actual loss, and would have received interest at the rate of four per cent. during the whole period of the investment. He considered this very satisfactory, and was, moreover, of opinion that the general feeling amongst the proprietors, and also in high and influential quarters, was that it was not fit that a large estate like that in Ireland should be held by a company in London. They had done their best to manage the estates well and carefully; but, after all, that strip of silver sea—to say nothing of many miles of land—had necessarily prevented them from doing all that they would have been glad

to have done. Most probably they would have noticed amongst the current reports of the day the actions brought against and defended by the society. Now, if there was one principle which the directors had been most anxious to maintain, it was their desire to avoid litigation; if they did err to err on the side of admitting claims rather than disputing them. They had felt it only their duty, however, to pursue the course they had done in reference to the action to which he had referred, and their interests in the matter were efficiently protected by the company's solicitor and counsel. By this means they were able to successfully defeat a most unrighteous and fraudulent claim. They had considered it due to the society, and also in the interest of all other insurance offices, to set their faces resolutely against the claim, and, he was happy to say, most successfully. He should also like to say a word as to the form of accounts. Under the provisions of the recent Act of Parliament, they had to make periodical returns to the Board of Trade, and if any gentleman had the first return he would perceive a difference as compared with this return—a difference, however, which was apparent not real. Their deed of settlement necessitated that their accounts should set down what they had actually received and paid in cash during the year. Now, claims might be made upon them during the last three months, which claims were not yet due for payment; but they were obliged to put these down in the returns to the Board of Trade, but they were not rendered in the accounts to the proprietary. Anybody might think that they told two different tales, but the explanation really was that there were two different laws, which required a different form of account, although, at the same time, precisely identical. He must next refer to another important subject—the cost of management. Their accounts would bear comparison with those of any other company, society, or partnership to which it was possible to allude. They had no agents in any part of the kingdom (Glasgow excepted); they transacted their own business entirely, but they allowed commission to parties bringing business to the office. Treating this commission as part of the expenses, the management of the whole society was £3 17s. 2d. per cent.; writing off this commission, the cost of management was £1 14s. per cent. He thought that this would bear successful comparison with any statement of figures of any other office or society; and he considered that they had reason to congratulate themselves upon the reasonable system of expenditure. As they were men of business, and had their occupations to attend to, he was sure they would have no pleasure in listening to long speeches, as he had no pleasure in making them. They had all of them an interest in increasing the business of the office, and the directors had done all they possibly could to get business. There was a time when they had a clean sweep, when there was but one law insurance office, and to this all the business came; but now there were three or four offices. He felt it expedient to state, therefore, as an additional inducement to the proprietors to increase their business, that policies effected in the present year would participate in the bonus—which they hoped would be a large one—to be divided at their next quinquennial period. This was certainly an additional inducement to their friends to bring business in at once. He then concluded by moving the adoption of the report.

Sir C. R. TURNER seconded the resolution, which was unanimously carried by the meeting.

In reply to a question as to whether there would be any difficulty in the Board of Trade accounts being sent to the shareholders,

The CHAIRMAN stated that the accounts could be seen at the office, and that as they were long they had not been circulated on account of the expense. The directors, however, would consider the matter.

A vote of thanks was then moved to the directors for the admirable manner in which they conducted its business.

A PROPRIETOR gave notice of motion for the next meeting to the effect that a proprietor be enabled to bequeath shares to his wife or child, or to trustees to hold them, such wife or child not having the power to transfer them except to persons duly qualified to hold them.

The CHAIRMAN said—On behalf of my colleagues and myself, I beg to thank you most heartily for this kind expression of your goodwill. We desire and endeavour to do all we can to promote the prosperity of your society: and I think the statement of accounts shows that our exertions have not been made in vain.

The proceedings then terminated.

ARTICLED CLERKS' SOCIETY.

A meeting of this society was held at Clement's-inn Hall on Wednesday, 14th February, 1872, Mr. E. W. Dendy in the chair, when the "Davis Prize, 1871," was presented to Mr. N. Hanhart, LL.B., the writer of the best essay on "The Law Relating to the Property of Married Women."

LAW STUDENTS' DEBATING SOCIETY.

At the Law Institution, on Tuesday last (Mr. Woolf in the chair), the question discussed was No. 490 legal:—"A tenant takes a farm under agreement not to destroy any game, or keep dogs destructive thereof, and on request of landlord to forbid persons hunting, shooting, coursing, or trespassing on the farm, and to endeavour, to the utmost of his power, to preserve all game thereon. Is a conviction of the tenant for killing game on the farm contrary to 1 & 2 Will. 4, c. 32, s. 12, good?" In the absence of Mr. Austin, the debate was opened by Mr. Hay in the affirmative, and after discussion was so decided by the society by a small majority.

THE JUDICATURE COMMISSION.

The following resolutions of the Judicature Commission were finally agreed to on the 31st ult.:

RESOLUTIONS PASSED 1ST MARCH, 1871.

COUNTY COURTS.—1. That the registrar of the county court, in addition to his present powers, should have power to dispose of the following business (subject to exceptions for special cause), viz.:—(a.) Claims under £5. (b.) Cases in which both parties agree that the registrar may decide. That all other business up to the present limit should be disposed of by the judge; and that plaintiffs should be allowed to commence proceedings in the county court, whatever be the nature of the suit, and whatever the amount, leaving it for the defendant to remove for cause shown into the superior court, if it involves a sum exceeding the present limit. 2. That the court fees should be revised, and should be collected by stamps. 3. That the parties should be allowed to serve their own process, other than writs of execution. 4. That arrangements should be made for the speedy abolition of the office of treasurer of the county courts; and that a considerable reduction should be made in the number of high bailiffs and registrars. 5. That a reduction should be made in the number of county court judges, and a new arrangement made of the districts of county courts, and of the circuits of county court judges, and offices substituted for courts, where the amount of business is not sufficient to justify the continuation of a court.

RESOLUTIONS PASSED 8TH MARCH, 1871.

SUPERIOR COURTS.—6. That a branch of the High Court of Justice be established for each of two districts to be formed out of the counties of Lancaster and York, and the parts of Cheshire adjacent to Lancashire, and the counties north of Lancashire and Yorkshire, such districts to be styled respectively the north-west and north-east districts of the high court. 7. That two judges of the high court (who shall, unless any other arrangement be made among the judges of the High Court, be the junior judges for the time being) shall discharge the duties connected with the said districts, and shall each be paid a sum of £ , in addition to salary, to meet the extra expenses connected with residence in either of the said districts. 8. That if, and as may be necessary, in order to meet the requirements of judicial service in the said districts, one more judge, or two more judges, of the high court should be appointed. 9. That the plaintiff in any cause in the high court may mark or lay the venue of the same for or in either of the said districts (subject to removal for sufficient cause), and thereupon the trial of the said cause, and all interlocutory and other proceedings therein, which can according to the rules of the high court be heard before one judge, and also the Admiralty business, if any, in the said district, and all criminal business within the district, which would be tried at present on circuit, shall be disposed of by the judge of the high court in such district. 10. That any cause not marked for or of which the venue is not laid in either of the said districts, may nevertheless be sent for trial, or for any other specified purpose, to one of the said districts courts, by order of a judge. 11. That, with the exception of the times of vacation and of the circuits after mentioned, the courts in

each of the said districts shall sit continuously, the court of the north-west district at Liverpool, Manchester, or Preston, and the court of the north-east district at Sheffield, Leeds, or York, and that at the times of circuit the two judges of the said district shall join and become judges of assize for all the assize towns to the north of Preston and York respectively. 12. That rules should be made for the trial or hearing of cases in the said districts, and of interlocutory applications therein, at the places and in the manner most convenient to the suitors. 13. That a re-arrangement of the circuits, omitting the said districts, and that of the metropolis be made.

RESOLUTIONS PASSED 8TH JANUARY, 1872.

COUNTY COURTS.—14. That the report be adopted so far as it recommends the substitution for the present registrars of paid registrars at fixed salaries to perform the duties in the report mentioned, and so far as it recommends the consolidation of county court districts, which, in the opinion of the commission, is practicable and desirable, although the exact amount of consolidation and consequent saving will have to be determined hereafter in detail in any legislative measure introduced for carrying the report into effect. 15. That the county courts in future should administer common law, equity, and Admiralty jurisdiction as one system, in accordance with the recommendations made in relation to the supreme court by the first report of this commission.

RESOLUTIONS PASSED 23RD JANUARY, 1872.

COUNTY COURTS.—16. That the county courts be annexed to and form branches of the high court, and the judges and registrars of the county courts respectively be attached to and be officers of the high court, and (subject to the General Rules) respectively continue to have and exercise all such jurisdiction as they respectively now possess, together with such further and other jurisdiction as recommended. 17. That in any action for the recovery of debt or damages exceeding £20, process may be issued at any office of the high court or of any county court, although the appearance of other matter required is to be, or to be performed, elsewhere. 18. That where the existing limit of the jurisdiction of the county court is £20, the same should be extended to £50. 19. That where the existing limit of the jurisdiction of the county court is £10, the same should be extended to £50. 20. That such jurisdiction of the county court as last mentioned shall not be limited to certain kinds of torts, but should extend to all actions of tort.

RESOLUTIONS PASSED 26TH JANUARY, 1872.

COUNTY COURTS.—21. That if in any action in the high court the plaintiff shall recover a sum not exceeding £50, the costs (if any) allowed him shall not exceed the amount which he would have been allowed if the action had been commenced and prosecuted in the county court, unless a judge shall otherwise order. 22. That a judge may order the plaintiff to compensate the defendant for any additional costs incurred by him in consequence of the action not having been commenced and prosecuted in the county court. 23. That in all actions commenced and prosecuted in the high court, in which the amount recovered, or sought to be recovered, does not exceed £100, the costs (if any be recoverable) shall be taxed on a lower scale than that from time to time applicable to other actions in the high court, unless a judge shall otherwise order.

LOCAL COURTS.—24. That the jurisdiction of the Chancellor's courts of the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge should be abolished, in respect of all actions, suits, or matters cognisable in the superior or county courts. 25. That the jurisdiction of the court of the Vice-Warden of the Stannaries should be transferred to the courts or judges exercising bankruptcy jurisdiction within the Stannaries of Devon and Cornwall. 26. That the jurisdiction of the Mayor's Court of the City of London, the Passage Court of Liverpool, the Tolzey Court of Bristol, and the Salford Hundred Court of Record, should be abolished in respect of all actions, suits, or matters cognisable in the superior or county courts. 27. That all other local and inferior courts of civil jurisdiction should be abolished.

RESOLUTIONS PASSED 31ST JANUARY, 1872.

28. That the Court of Common Pleas at Lancaster and the Court of Pleas of the County Palatine of Durham should be abolished. 29. That the Admiralty Court of the Cinque Ports should be abolished. 30. That it is desirable that

registries or offices of the high court for the transaction of interlocutory and other business to be defined should be established in certain places to be named from time to time. The registrars or officers at such registries or offices to be the registrars of the county courts when thought fit, or persons specially appointed for such purpose. 31. That the district registries of the Probate Court be abolished, and their business transferred to the registries established under the foregoing resolution, and when no such registry is established, then to the registry of some county court.

PUBLIC COMPANIES.

GOVERNMENT FUNDS.

LAST QUOTATION, Feb. 16, 1872.

From the Official List of the actual business transacted.

3 per Cent. Consols, 92½	Annuities, April, '85
Ditto for Account, Mar. 1, 92½	Do. (Red Sea T.) Aug. 1908
3 per Cent. Reduced 92½	Ex Bills, £1000, — per Ct. 5 p m
New 3 per Cent., 92½	Ditto, £500, Do — 5 p m
Do. 3½ per Cent., Jan. '94	Ditto, £100 & £500, — 5 p m
Do. 2½ per Cent., Jan. '94	Bank of England Stock, 4½ per
Do. 5 per Cent., Jan. '73	Ct. (last half-year) 247
Annuities, Jan. '80 —	Ditto for Account,

INDIAN GOVERNMENT SECURITIES.

India Stk., 10½ p Ct. Apr. '74, 206	Ind. Enf. Fr., 5 p Ct., Jan. '73
Ditto for Account	Ditto, 5½ per Cent., May, '79 109
Ditto 5 per Cent., July, '80 110½	Ditto Debentures, per Cent.,
Ditto for Account, —	April, '84 —
Ditto 4 per Cent., Oct. '83 105	Do. Do 5 per Cent., Aug. '73 102½
Ditto, ditto, Certificates, —	Do. Bonds, 4 per Ct., £1000 23 p m
Ditto Rupee Ppr., 4 per Cent. 96½	Ditto, ditto, under £1000, 23 p m

RAILWAY STOCK.

	Railways.	Paid.	Closing prices.
Stock	Bristol and Exeter	100	111
Stock	Caledonian	100	116½
Stock	Glasgow and South-Western	100	127
Stock	Great Eastern Ordinary Stock	100	5½
Stock	Great Northern	100	140
Stock	Do., A Stock*	100	163
Stock	Great Southern and Western of Ireland	100	114
Stock	Great Western—Original	100	113
Stock	Lancashire and Yorkshire	100	158
Stock	London, Brighton, and South Coast	100	75
Stock	London, Chatham, and Dover	100	37½
Stock	London and North-Western	100	139
Stock	London and South-Western	100	113½
Stock	Manchester, Sheffield, and Lincoln	100	74
Stock	Metropolitan	100	63½
Stock	Midland	100	143
Stock	Do., Birmingham and Derby	100	113
Stock	North British	100	99
Stock	North London	100	127
Stock	North Staffordshire	100	81
Stock	South Devon	100	74½
Stock	South-Eastern	100	99
Stock	Taff Vale	100	163

* A receives no dividend until 6 per cent. has been paid to B.

INSURANCE COMPANIES.

No. of Shares	Dividend per annum	Names.	Shares.	Paid.	Price per share.
5000	5 p c & 6 s	Clerical, Med. & Gen. Life	100	10 0	0 23 0 0
4000	4 p c & 6 s	County	100	10 0	0 85 0 0
34440	5 p c & 6 s	Eagle	50	5 0	0 8 0 0
10000	10 per cent	Equity and Law	100	6 0	0 9 5 0
20000	7½ 10s p c	English & Scot. Law Life	50	3 10	0 3 12 6
2700	5 per cent	Equitable Reversionary	100	5 0	0 94 10 0
4600	5 per cent	Do. New	80	50 0	0 43 10 0
8000	5 & 2 p s b	Gresham Life	50	5 0	0 32 10 0
20000	5 p c & 6 s	Guardian	100	50 0	0 4 13 0
20000	6 per cent	Home & Col. Ass., Limitd.	100	10 0	0 16 12 6
7500	10 per cent	Imperial Life	100	2 10	0 3 10 0
60000	15 per cent	Law Fire	100	96 5	0 96 0 0
10000	4½ 4 p s & b	Law Life	10	0 10	0 0 17 6
100000	12 per cent	Law Union	50	8 0	0 9 0 0
20000	5½ 17s 6 p c	Legal & General Life	50	3 17	0 4 13 0
20000	4½ 13s 9 p c	London & Provincial Law	50	6 5	0 25 10 0
40000	20 per cent	North Brit. & Mercantile	100	10 0	0 33 0 0
3500	12½ & 6 s	Provident Life	100	10 0	0 33 0 0
89220	20 per cent	Royal Exchange	Stock	All	£241

MONEY MARKET AND CITY INTELLIGENCE.

The money market has shown this week a partial recovery from its previous depression; in fact, the markets generally appear now in a healthy condition.

The prospectus of the Share Investment Trust has appeared, the first issue to be not less than £500,000, or more

than £2,000,000 in subscriptions of £100. Each subscriber of £100 will receive one £100 six per cent. preference certificate, redeemable by an accumulative sinking fund of 1 per cent. per annum by yearly drawings at the price of £100, and also one £100 deferred certificate, entitling the holder to the surplus income, and ultimately to the capital of the trust fund. The present scheme proposes to embrace a number of well-selected industrial undertakings, yielding high rates of interest. The greater variety in the investments will have the effect of extending the average, and further distributing the risk, thus making one class of investment insure the other. It is believed that a selection of good undertakings can be made which will yield a present return on the investment price of about 9 per cent., sufficient to pay the interest and sinking fund, and commence with a fair dividend on the deferred certificates.

Lord St. Leonards completed his ninety-first year last Monday, having been born on the 12th of February, 1781.

Mr. John V. Longbourne, of Gray's-inn, solicitor, qualified, at the Epiphany Sessions of the magistrates for the western division of the county of Sussex, as a justice of the peace for that county.

The Right Hon. Sir James Weir Hogg, Bart., late a member of the Indian Council, who was recently sworn one of her Majesty's Privy Council, is the eldest son of the late William Hogg, Esq. (some time of Lisburn, and afterwards of Belmont, co. Antrim), by the daughter of James Dickey, Esq., of Dunmore, in the same county. He was born in 1790, and was educated at Trinity College, Dublin, where he held a scholarship in 1808. A few years after he was called to the Bar, and then proceeded to Calcutta, where he practised with much success, and finally held the office of registrar of the Supreme Court there. He returned to England in June, 1833, and in the following year was elected M.P. for Beverley, which he continued to represent till 1847, and was M.P. for Honiton from that year till 1857. In 1839 he was elected a director of the East India Company, and became chairman of that body in 1846; he was appointed a member of the Council of India in September, 1858, and served as Vice-President in 1860. By his marriage, in 1822, with Mary, second daughter of Samuel Swinton, Esq., of the Bengal Civil Service, he had a family of seven sons and seven daughters. His eldest son is Colonel J. M. Hogg, M.P. for Truro, and Chairman of the Metropolitan Board of Works; his second son, the late Charles Swinton Hogg, was a barrister, and held the office of Administrator-General of Bengal at the time of his death, about two years ago.

THE NEW M.P. FOR NORTH-WEST YORKSHIRE.—Mr. Francis Sharp Powell, barrister-at-law, who has been returned to Parliament as member for the North-West Riding of Yorkshire, in succession to the late Sir Francis Crossley, Bart., is a son of the late Rev. Benjamin Powell, of Wigan (who died in 1861), by Anne, daughter of the late Rev. T. Wade, and niece of the late Francis Sharp Bridges, of Horton Old Hall, Bradford. He was born in 1827, and was educated at St. John's College, Cambridge, where he graduated B.A. (a senior optime and second class in classics) in 1850, and was elected a fellow of his college in 1851. In April, 1853, he was called to the Bar at the Inner Temple; for some time he went the Northern Circuit, but afterwards relinquished practice. Mr. Powell unsuccessfully contested the borough of Wigan in July, 1852, and again in October, 1854; but being elected in March, 1857, he sat till April, 1859, when he was again defeated. He was elected for Cambridge in February, 1863, and represented that constituency till the dissolution in November, 1868, but was defeated at the general election which followed. At the beginning of 1871 he also sustained an unsuccessful contest for the representation of Staleybridge, which seat was gained by Mr. N. Buckley. Mr. Powell is a justice of the peace for Lancashire and the West Riding of York, and a fellow of the Royal Geographical Society. In 1858 he married Anne, second daughter of Matthew Gregson, Esq., of Toxteth Park, Liverpool.

BIRTHS, MARRIAGES, AND DEATHS.

BIRTHS.

COLTMAN—On Feb. 10, at 24, Hyde-park-gate South, the wife of Francis J. Coltmán, Esq., barrister-at-law, of a daughter.

LAWRANCE—On Feb. 11, at 12, Kent-terrace, Regent's-park, the wife of George Woodford Lawrence, of Lincoln's-inn, barrister-at-law, of a son.

SWARBRECK—On Feb. 7, the wife of Chas. McC. Swarbrick, Esq., solicitor, Thirsk, of a daughter.

MARRIAGES.

LEWIS—KINGLAKE—On Feb. 8, at St. Saviour's Church, Pimlico, Richard Lewis, barrister-at-law, and secretary of the National Lifeboat Institution, to Eliza Mary, eldest daughter of the late Mr. Serjeant Kinglake, M.P. for Rochester, and Recorder of Bristol.

DEATHS.

CARLINE—On Feb. 11, at Lincoln, Henry S. Carline, solicitor, aged 28 years.

KETTLER—On Jan. 27, at Old Government House, Guernsey, John Lucena Ross Kettle, Esq., barrister-at-law, in the 63rd year of his age.

YONGE—On Feb. 10, at Islington, Mr. John Yonge, solicitor, of the Strand, aged 66.

ESTATE EXCHANGE REPORT.

AT THE MART.

Feb. 6.—By Messrs. FAREBROTHER, CLARK & Co. Harts, near Lyndhurst, freehold residential estate of 59a. 0r. 13p. Sold £5,000.

Freehold farm of 21a. 0r. 19p. Sold £1,700.

A plot of land, containing 6a. 1r. 5p. Sold £200.

A ditto of 2a. 0r. 1p. Sold £80.

A ditto containing 3a. 1r. 35p. Sold £130.

Hill Farm, containing 251a. 1r. 9p., freehold. Sold £5,000.

Feb. 7.—By Messrs. NORTON, THIST, WATNEY & Co. Rotherhithe (in Chancery), freehold cottage properties—Nos. 1 to 12, Oak-place. Sold £890.

Feb. 8.—By Messrs. WINSTANLEY & HORWOOD. Ten shares in the Auction Mart Company (fully paid up). Sold £140.

Four ditto. Sold £52.

By Messrs. C. C. & T. MOORE. Stepney.—Nos. 39 to 55, St James's-place, term 67 years. Sold £450.

No. 196, Oxford-street, term 30 years. Sold £205.

Limehouse.—Nos. 13 and 14, George-street, copyhold. Sold £260.

Feb. 13.—By Messrs. DEBENHAM, TEWSON & FARMER. Blackheath, the lease of Vanbrugh-cottage, term six years. Sold £100.

Feb. 14.—By Messrs. EDWIN FOX & BOUSFIELD. Kent, Aylesford.—The lease of the Medway Brick and Cement Works, together with the plant and machinery, and 57 acres of land, term 1½ years. Sold £8,000.

Feb. 15.—REYNOLDS & EASON. Peckham.—Nos. 1 to 8, Maismore-square, term 65 years. Sold £740.

By Messrs. NEWBON & HARDING. Pentonville.—No. 15, Lloyd-square, term 50 years. Sold £505.

LONDON GAZETTES.

Winding up of Joint Stock Companies.

FRIDAY, Feb. 9, 1872.

LIMITED IN CHANCERY.

Tram Railway Company of Great Britain (Limited).—Petition for winding up, presented Feb. 6, directed to be heard before the Master of the Rolls, on Feb. 17. Smith, Gresham House, Old Broad-st., solicitor for the petitioners.

COUNTY PALATINE OF LANCASTER.

FRIDAY, Feb. 9, 1872.

Mutual Land Company (Limited).—Vice Chancellor Little has, by an order dated Jan. 28, appointed John Bewley, 4, Brown's-bldg, Lpool, to be official liquidator. Creditors are required, on or before Feb. 24, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to the above. Friday, March 8 at 10, is appointed for hearing and adjudicating upon the debts and claims.

Creditors under Estates in Chancery.

Last Day of Proof.

FRIDAY, Feb. 9, 1872.

Calton, Jas, Brencley, Kent, Farmer. March 1. Thorpe & White, V.C. Wickens. Eyke & Co, Lincoln's-inn-fields. Kain, Jas Patrick, Poulton-le-Sands, Lancashire, Contractor. March 14. Kain & Wilson, V.C. Wickens. Sharp & Son, Lancashire. Lotts, John, Mile End-rd. Feb. 15. Lotts & Lotts, V.C. Malins. Merriman & Co, Queen-st, Chesham. Milnes, Chas Gery, Beckenham, Lincoln. Feb. 24. Gery & Handley, V.C. Bacon. Newbald & Falkner, Newark. Mocatta, Emanuel, Blomfield-rd, Maida-hill, Esq. March 5. Mocatta & Mocatta, M.R. Hampson & Co, Finsbury-circus. Rushforth, John, Fir Orange House, nr Harrogate, York, Yeoman. March 1. Swale & Bland, M.R. Powell, Harrogate. Sheppard, Thos Bailey, Berkeley, Gloucester, Registrar of Births. March 1. Bailey & Bailey, V.C. Wickens. Gaisford & Scott, Berkeley.

Buckingham, Chas Wm, Sylvan-rd, Essex, out of business. Feb 16 at 12, at offices of Morphet, Moorgate-st. Payne, Finsbury-pavement
 Chaffer, Alfd, Barnsey, York, Smallware Dealer. Feb 28 at 10, at office of Dibb, Regent-st, Barnsey
 Cheekley, Wm Gregory, Warwick, Plumber. Feb 23 at 2, at the Woolpack Hotel, Warwick. Snake
 Cobb, John Fras, Newport, Salop, Architect. Feb 21 at 2, at the Royal Victoria Hotel, Newport. Heane
 Colliver, Thos, Bangor Slate Quarries, Llanllechid, Carnarvon, Quarry Proprietor. Feb 22 at 2, at the Castle Hotel Bangor. Foulkes, Bangor
 Cox, John Cox, Bath, Law Clerk. Feb 15 at 12, at the County Court Office, Abbey-st, Bath
 Cross, Giles, Dinton, nr Salisbury, Dairyman. Feb 19 at 2, at the White Hart Hotel, Salisbury. Jones & Co, Lancaster-pl, Strand
 Davidson, Chas, Albany-rd, Camberwell, Advertising Agent. Feb 19 at 2, at office of Darville, Finsbury-pavement
 Dyball, Edwrd, Barnet, Herts, Jeweller. Feb 22 at 2, at offices of Lewis, Cheapside
 Edwards, Morgan, Aberdare, Butcher. Feb 22 at 11, at offices of Roesser & Phillips, Canon-st, Aberdare
 Edwards, Wm, Bremley, Stafford, Innkeeper. Feb 19 at 11, at offices of Day & Ivens, Vicar st, Kidderminster
 Elgar, Geo Fredk, Crockshaw, Kent, Farmer. Feb 24 at 2, at Slater's, High-st, Canterbury. Wilks, Hythe
 Elliott, John, Upper Whitecross-st, St Luke's, Fishmonger. Feb 19 at 3, at the George & Dragon Tavern, Beesh-st, Barbican. Hicks, Landown-ter, Gresham-rd, Victoria-pl
 Ellison, Richd, Lpool, Flour Dealer. March 1 at 2, at office of Toulmin & Co, Lord-st, Lpool
 Forrest, Saml, Everton, Lpool, Builder. Feb 28 at 3, at offices of Barrell & Rodway, Lord-st, Lpool
 Gambrell, Thos Boys, Potnam, Kent, Miller. Feb 27 at 3, at the Queen's Head, Watling-st, Canterbury
 Geeves, Hy, Red Lion-st, Wandsworth, Broker. Feb 21 at 2, at 1 Bank-bldgs, Wandsworth. Jones, Wandsworth
 George, Robt, Worcester, Trace Maker. Feb 26 at 11, at office of Corbett, Avenue House, The Cross, Worcester
 Gerrish, Isaac, Melksham, Wilts, Lodging House Keeper. Feb 26 at 12, at offices of Rawlings, Melksham
 Gray, Fredk, Birm, Lamp Maker. Feb 16 at 3, at office of Kennedy, New-st, Birm
 Greenshields, Hy David, Sandringham-rd, Dalston, Chemist. Feb 20 at 11, at the Hop Exchange, Southwark-st, Borough. Arnold, Southwark-exchange
 Griffiths, John Staff, Stepney-green, out of business. Feb 19 at 2, at 12, Hatton-gdn. Hope, Serie st, Lincoln's inn
 Hambridge, Geo Hy, Northampton, Boot Manufacturer. Feb 19 at 12, at offices of Pittman, Guildhall-chambers, Basinghall-st
 Helme, Thos, Preston, Lancashire, Fish Dealer. Feb 13 at 11, at office of Turner & Son, Fox-st, Preston
 Howlett, John, High-st, Deptford, Greengrocer. Feb 19 at 12, at office of Marshall, Hatton-gdn. Hope, Serie-st
 Hunt, Saml, Ryde, Isle of Wight, Poulterer. Feb 23 at 10.30, at the Nelson Hotel, Nelson-st, Ryde. Joyce, Newport
 Inman, Joseph, Scotton, York, Teacher. Feb 27 at 1, at offices of Hirst & Capes, Knaresborough
 Jacobson, Lewis Jacob, Spring-st, Paddington, out of business. March 1 at 12, at offices of Nicholson, Gresham-st. Montagu, Bucklersbury
 Jeffries, Edmond, Lancaster-rd, Notting-hill, Statuary. Feb 21 at 2, at offices of Tilly & Shepton, Finsbury-st, South
 Jones, Morgan, Marylanda-rd, Harrow-rd, Painter. Feb 26 at 3, at offices of Wright, Bedford-row
 Jordan, John Israel, Tredegar-row, Dow, Baker. Feb 23 at 3, at offices of Young & Sons, Mark-lane
 Kenyon, Hartley, Manch, Chemist. Feb 26 at 3, at offices of Sampson, South King-st, Manch
 Langtree, John, Joshua Whalley, Thos Stephenson, & Adam Stephenson, Nelson-in-Marsden, Lancashire, Manufacturers. Feb 23 at 11, at offices of Boote & Edgar, George-st, Manch
 Lawrence, John, Brettell-lane, Stafford, Licensed Victualler. Feb 22 at 3, at offices of Rowlands, Stafford
 Lewis, Hy, Long-lane, Smithfield. Feb 19 at 3, at the Guildhall Coffee House, Gresham-st. Lindo, King's-arms-yd, Moorgate-st
 Lewis, Richd, & Alfred Preece, Wolverhampton, Stafford, Painters. Feb 26 at 3, at offices of Stratton, Queen-st, Wolverhampton
 Love, John, Kingston, Surrey, Draper. Feb 19 at 2, at offices of Haigh, King-st, Cheapside
 Luckings, John, St Anne's, Lewes, Sussex, Publican. Feb 28 at 12.30, at the Brewers' Arms Inn, High-st, St Michael's, Lewes. Holman, St Michael's, Lewes
 Macarty, Wm, jun, Pendleton, Lancashire, Wholesale Confectioner. Feb 22 at 3, at office of Hardy, St James's-sq, Manch
 Mace, Thos Kimp, Birm, Hatter. Feb 21 at 12, at offices of Griffin, Bennett's-hill, Birm
 Manham, Saml, Leeds, Jeweller. Feb 22 at 3, at offices of Ferns, Leeds
 Manners, Jesse, Mile Elm, nr Calne, Wilts, Farmer. Feb 26 at 12, at the White Hart Inn, Calne. Wilton, Bath
 Mansfield, Danl, & Albert John Ravenshear Booth, Buckingham, Builders. Feb 23 at 10, at the Swan & Castle Hotel, Buckingham
 Kilby & Son, Banbury
 Matthews, Richd Robt, Bishop's Castle, Salop, Watchmaker. Feb 29 at 2, at the Church Stretton Hotel, Church Stretton, Walker, Church Stretton
 McCarthy, Jas, Brompton, Kent, Sawyer. March 3 at 3, at offices of Stephenson, New-rd, Chatham
 Millican, Jas, Maryport, Cumberland, Licensed Victualler. Feb 20 at 1, at office of Hayton & Simpson, Cockermouth
 Milton, Hy, Grange, Kent, Anchorsmith. Feb 26 at 3, at offices of Prall High-st, Rochester
 Mitchell, Wm, Brandon, Suffolk, Farmer. Feb 19 at 3.30, at the Guildhall Coffee House, Wilton, King's Lynn
 Moody, Ttos Huggans, Southsea, Hants, Grocer. Feb 23 at 12, at office of Smith, King-st, Cheapside. King, Fortes
 Mutten, Joseph Holten, Plymouth, Devon, Draper. Feb 22 at noon, at offices of Edmonds & Son, Farade, Plymouth

Moore, Walter, Bradford, York, Merchant. Feb 19 at 11, at offices of Terry & Robinson, Market-st, Bradford
 Nicholson, John Stuart, Inkerman-ter, Kensington, out of employ. Feb 16 at 3, at offices of Howell, Cheapside
 Noohury, Geo, Marple, Chester, Grocer. Feb 21 at 12, at the Vernon Arms Inn, Warren-st, Stockport. Hand, Macclesfield
 Nowell, Thos & John Coates, Bristol, Tailors. Feb 20 at 12, at offices of Parsons, Nicholas-st, Bristol. Benson & Elletson, Bristol
 Pearson, Thos Jennett, Gorleston, Suffolk, Linen Draper. Feb 26 at 12, at office of Palmer, South-quay, Gt Yarmouth
 Peirce, Alfd Edwrd, Oxford-st, Engineer. Feb 23 at 2, at office of Lewin, Southampton-st, Strand
 Phelan, John, Bristol, Egg Dealer. Feb 19 at 12, at office of Collins, Broad-st. Benson & Elletson, Bristol
 Price, John Alfd, Ealing Dean, Middx, Plumber. Feb 19 at 3, at 3, Lincoln's-inn-flds. Marshall
 Richards, John, Lpool, Cigar Importer. Feb 23 at 2, at office of Duke & Goffey, Commerce-chambers, Lord st, Lpool
 Robertson, Wm Stewart, Hampton-rd, Twickenham, Draper. Feb 19 at 11, at offices of Haigh, King-st, Cheapside
 Rose, John, Ealing, Middx, Builder. Feb 23 at 12, at office of Dubois, Gresham-bldgs, Basinghall-st. Dubois, King-st, Cheapside
 Schofield, Amos, Jamaica-rd, Bermondsey, Beerhouse Keeper. Feb 25 at 3, at offices of Huchin & Washington, Trinity sq, Southwark
 Skelton, Fredk, St John's-rd, Hoxton, Tailor. Feb 16 at 2, at office of Wills & Co, Gresham-bldgs, Basinghall-st. Knight
 Stirr, John, Merton-rd, Wandsworth, Comm Agent. Feb 21 at 2, at 1, Bank bldgs, Wandsworth. Jones, Wandsworth
 Syckelmore, Thos, Southborough, Kent, Clothier. Feb 20 at 12, at offices of Nicholson, Gresham-st. Montagu, Bucklersbury
 Synnott, John, Gun-rd, Battersea, Builder. Feb 17 at 12, at office of Condy, Christchurch, Battersea
 Taylor, Josiah, Hunslet, Leeds, Grocer. Feb 22 at 11, at offices of Pullan, Bank-chambers, Park-rd, Leeds
 Templeman, Geo Jas, Yeovil, Somerset, Timber Merchant's Foreman. Feb 26 at 11, at the Mermaid Hotel, High-st, Yeovil. Glyde
 Thomas, Wm, Swansea, Glamorgan, Grocer. Feb 21 at 2, at offices of Barnard & Co, Albion-chambers, Bristol. Jones, Swansea
 Tomlinson, Benj, Wednesbury, Stafford, Gun-lock Manufacturer. Feb 23 at 11, at offices of Slater, Butcher, Darlaston
 Tucker, Wm, Albion-pl, Hyde-pk-sq, Brewer. Feb 24 at 3, at the Mason's Hall, Mason's-avenue. Dobie, Basinghall-st
 Whitaker, Thos, Heanor, Derby, Builder. Feb 28 at 3, at offices of Woodier, Robt, Wigan, Lancashire, Builder. Feb 26 at 2, at offices of Gibson & Bolland, South John-st, Lpool
 Woolan, Benj Minors, Cheapside, Accountant. Feb 16 at 2, at 33, Gutter-lane. Plunkett, Gutter-lane

TUESDAY, FEB. 13, 1872.

Abbott, Mary Anne, Framingham, Suffolk, Schoolmistress. Feb 27 at 12 at office of Pollard, St Laurence st, Ipswich
 Allen, Joseph, Lpool, Painter. March 1 at 3, at office of Wilson, Lord st, Lpool
 Askey, Wm Dryden, Durham, Grocer. Feb 23 at 11, at office of Salkeld, Sadler st, Durham
 Bianchi, Fras, Gresham st, Ironmonger. Feb 23 at 12, at the Queen's Hotel, Birm. Griffin, Birm
 Bradbury, Joseph Hy, Weston-super-Mare, Somerset, Clothier. Feb 27 at 3, at the White Lion Hotel, Broad st, Bristol
 Breathart, Chas, Chapel Bar, Nottingham, General Dealer. March 1 at 2, at the Assembly rooms, Low Pavement. Cranah 3 Rowe
 Brewster, Wm, Huddesdon, Herts, Relieving Officer. Feb 25 at 11, at the Salisbury Arms Inn, Huddesdon. Glsby
 Butt, Jas, Stroud, Gloucester, Ironmonger. March 2 at 11.30, at the Unicorn Hotel, Worcester. Winterbottom, Stroud
 Calvert, Joseph, Yarm, York, Commercial Traveller. Feb 26 at 11, at offices of Fawcett & Co, Finkle st, Stockton-on-Tees
 Campbell, Wm, Leeds, no business. Feb 24 at 3, at the Trevelyan Hotel, Corporation st, Manch. Hope
 Carmichael, Jas Dodington, Waterloo, Hants, Colonel. Feb 26 at 2, at offices of Linklater & Co, Walbrook
 Carter, Chas, & Jabez Carter, Darlaston, Stafford, Nut Manufacturers. Feb 27 at 11, at offices of Slater, Butcher, Darlaston
 Clearbrough, Jas, Sheffield, Coal Agent. Feb 26 at 2, at offices of Taylor, Norfolk row, Sheffield
 Coley, Jas, Wolverhampton, Stafford, Hosier. March 2 at 12, at office of Barrow, Queen st, Wolverhampton
 Cornell, Edwrd Jas Fras, Orettingham, Suffolk, Grocer. Feb 27 at 3, at office of Hill, St Nicholas st, Ipswich
 Dickinson, Hy, Bedmond, nr St Alban's, Herts, Farmer. Feb 23 at 3, at offices of Anceley, Verulam st, St Alban's
 Dorrner, Wm Hy, Bandon rd, Bethel green, Assistant Relieving Officer. March 6 at 2, at offices of Hutson, Upper Clifton st, Finsbury
 Dunn, John, Newcastle-upon-Tyne, Innkeeper. Feb 29 at 2, at offices of Joel, Market st, Newcastle-upon-Tyne
 Eoob, Justinian, Huddersfield, York, Innkeeper. Feb 24 at 10, at office of Sykes, Market walk, Huddersfield
 Frankish, Thos, High st, Southwark, Hop Merchant. March 5 at 2, at the Guildhall Tavern, King st, Cheapside. Plews & Irvine, Mark lane
 Gardner, Wm, Cannock, Stafford, Seedsman. Feb 26 at 3, at office of Ebsworth, Bridge st, Wednesbury
 Gibbs, Wm, New North rd, Chesham, Grocer. Feb 20 at 3, at offices of Pearce & Son, Giltspur-st
 Gilder, Fras, Glendon rd, Notting hill. Feb 26 at 2, at offices of Barker, St Michael's house, St Michael's alley, Cornhill
 Goldthorp, Wm, Wakefield, York, Cabinet Maker. Feb 28 at 2, at offices of Harrison & Smith, Chancery lane, Wakefield
 Grimes, Jas, Jun, Kirkdale, nr Lpool, Builder. March 1 at 2, at office of Cooper, Union ct, Castle st, Lpool
 Gross, Hy Glenn, & Geo Edwrd Fox, Northampton, Shoe Manufacturers. Feb 23 at 2.30, at offices of Beeke, Market sq, Northampton
 Hall, Walter, Gayton, Norfolk, Farmer. Feb 29 at 12, at office of Coulton & Beloe, Ayton, nr King's Lynn
 Hearne, Wm, Tarvisock, Devon, Tea Dealer. March 1 at 11, at offices of Elworthy & Co, Courtenay st, Plymouth
 Hill, Richd, Heywood, Lancashire, General shop Keeper. Feb 24 at 11, at office of Orton, Ridgefield, Manch

Hilton, Atkins, jun, Tipton, Stafford, Grocer. Feb 29 at 12, at the Queen's Hotel, Stephenson pl, Birm. Baker, Wellington chambers
Hirst, Edmund, Alf Greenwood, & David Firth, Clayton, York, Manufacturing Chemists. Feb 26 at 10, at offices of Gant, Union passage, Kirkgate, Bradford
Hodgson, John Bassett, Cotton st, Whitechapel, Tailor. Feb 20 at 11, at offices of Dobson, Chancery chambers, Quality ct, Chancery lane
Hopkins, Wm Gratton, Kidderminster, Worcester, Grocer. Feb 28, at the Athenaeum rooms, Temple row, Birm. Prior, Kidderminster
Horne, Alf, Spa rd, Bermondsey, Grocer. Feb 23 at 12, at offices of Genassent, New Broad st
Horseley, Hy, jun, Leeds, Draper. Feb 26 at 2, at offices of Rooke & Midgley, Boar lane, Leeds
Humphreys, Thos, Hastings, Sussex, Tailor. Feb 26 at 12, at offices of Lawrence & Co, Old Jewry chambers, Chopside. Langham, Hastings
Hunt, Arthur John, Camberwell rd, Lambeth, Wine Merchant. Feb 29 at 4, at offices of Osborn, Clifford's inn, Fleet st
Hunt, Thos Willomatt, & Jas Smith, High st, Stratford, Provision Merchants. Feb 21 at 2, at offices of Foreman & Cooper, Gresham st, Holmes, Fenchurch st
Ingram, Saml, Balsall Heath, Worcester, Provision Dealer. Feb 26 at 11, at office of Allen, Union passage, Birm
Jefferson, John, Pickering Carr, York, Farmer. Feb 21 at 2, at offices of Parkinson, Pickering
Jeffries, Thos Chas, Kidderminster, Worcester, Oil Merchant. March 1st 12, at 13, Church st, Kidderminster. Prior
Jones, Ald Chas, Finsbury park College, Seven Sisters rd, Schoolmaster. Feb 28 at 3, at office of Tindale, Queen st
Jones, Hy Wm, W-dour st, Oxford st, Dealer in Glass. Feb 19 at 11, at 17, King st, Cheapside. Crump
Jones, Iles, Rhosymedre, nr Ruabon, Denbigh, Grocer. Feb 24 at 12, at the Lion Hotel, Hope st, Wrexham. Jones, Wrexham
Jones, John, Tanyfoel, Llanfachreth, Merioneth, Farmer. Feb 28 at 11, at offices of Pugh, Dolgelly
Joy, Alex Hy, Lancing, Sussex, Grocer. Feb 29 at 3, at office of Webb, Union st, Brighton
Lea, Richd & Ald Preece, Wolverhampton, Stafford, Painters. Feb 26 at 3, at offices of Stratton, Queen st, Wolverhampton
McKenna, Peter, Wigan, Lancashire, Grocer's Assistant. Feb 28 at 3, at office of France, Churchgate, Market pl, Wigan
Miles, Wm, jun, & Thos Miles, Kingston-on-Thames, Carriers. Feb 24 at 12, at office of Wilkinson & Howlett, Church st, Kingston-on-Thames
Mitchell, Thos, Cardiff, Glamorgan, Bootmaker. Feb 27 at 2, at offices of Bernard & Co, Crookherbtown, Cardiff. Griffith, Cardiff
Nunn, Philip Gwilt, Chaversham rd, Kentish inn, Gent. Feb 29 at 3, at offices of Lewis & Co, Old Jewry
Ormond, Hy, Hoo Farm, Enville, Stafford, Farmer. Feb 26 at 11, at the Stepponey Inn, Stourton. Price, Stourbridge
Osborne, Dinah, & Ald Rendle Fulford, Bristol, Grocers. Feb 23 at 19, at offices of Abbot & Leonard, Albion chambers, Bristol
Page, Jas, Bilston, Stafford, Provision Dealer. Feb 24 at 11, at offices of Fellows, Mount Pleasant, Bilston
Pardee, John, Oldbury, Worcester, Registrar of Births. Feb 28 at 11, at offices of Shakespeare, Church st, Oldbury
Parker, Wm, Blackwaters, Stafford, Builder. March 5 at 2, at the Railway Inn, Norton Bridge. Robinson & Dempster, Ecclestone
Pickering, Wm John, New Barnet, Herts, Coal Merchant. Feb 28 at 2, at 14, Southampton st, Bloomsbury. Routh & Stacey
Pickersgill, Saml, Blackheath, Stafford, Baker. Feb 26 at 11, at offices of Shakespeare, Church st, Oldbury
Ranson, John, Epsom, Surrey, Licensed Victualler. Feb 23 at 2, at offices of Apps, South sq, Gray's inn
Reese, John, & Evans Reese, Machynlleth, Montgomery, Watchmakers. Feb 24 at 1, at the Crown Hotel, Gwentbury. Williams, Newtown
Sanders, Geo Jolley, Northampton, Soda Water Manufacturer. Feb 23 at 11, at offices of Jeffery & Son, Newland, Northampton
Sanford, John, Red Lion sq, Photographic Dealer. Feb 26 at 12, at Smith's, St James st, Bedford row
Selwyn, Congreve, Welshampton, Salop, Clerk in Orders. Feb 23 at 12, at the George Hotel, Shrewsbury. Blackburne, Ellesmere
Sharman, Thos, St Neot's, Huntingdon, Butcher. Feb 26 at 3.15, at the Cross Keys Hotel, St Neot's. Conquest, Bedford
Scriff, Jas, Hovingham, York, Shaft Manufacturer. Feb 26 at 2, at the Crown Hotel, Melton. Spurr, Scarborough
Skellie, Niels Peter Hansen, Kingston-upon-Hull, Timber Merchant. Feb 29 at 12, at offices of Rolit & Sons, Trinity House lane, Kingston upon Hull
Smith, Wm, Scarborough, York, Outfitter. Feb 19 at 12, at the Station Hotel, York. Drawbridge & Rowntree, Scarborough
Smith, John, Bridgewater, Somerset, Grocer. Feb 27 at 12, at offices of Reed & Cook, King's sq, Bridgewater
Spall, Danl, Brill row, St Pancras, Gasfitter. Feb 27 at 3, at 88, Green st, Bethnal green. Hicks, Coleman st
Squad, Emma Hardman, Leeds, Shopkeeper. Feb 23 at 11, at offices of Fellau, Bank chambers, Park row, Leeds
Swann, Saml, Nottingham, Upholsterer. March 6 at 10, at offices of Acton, Imperial bldg, Victoria st, Nottingham
Sykesmoore, Jas, Tunbridge, Kent, Tailor. Feb 26 at 3, at offices of Nicholson, Gresham st, Montagu, Bucklersbury
Talbot, Eliza, Dover, Kent, Lodging-house Keeper. Feb 23 at 4, at office of Minter, Cast e st, Dover
Taylor, Geo, Bishopsgate rd, Devons rd, Bromley, Builder. Feb 26 at 2, at 7, Wilmington sq, Clerkenwell. Lewis
Thompson, Simon Robinson, High st, Funge, Grocer. Feb 27 at 2, at offices of Broad & Co, Poultrey. Carter & Bell, Leadenhall st
Thirkettle, Margaret, Sheerness, Kent, Fishmonger. Feb 23 at 1, at office of Copland Edward st, Sheerness
Villanueva, Fernando Lorenzo de Pedro, Edgbaston, Warwick, out of business. Feb 24 at 12, at office of Jaques, Cherry st, Birm
Vipord, Richd Robinson, Chorlton upon-Medlock, Manch, Laccman. Feb 29 at 3, at offices of W maley, Ridgefield, Manch
Weller, Ann, Brierley hill, Stafford, Grocer. Feb 23 at 2, at the Acorn Hotel, Temple st, Birm. Chulow, Brierley hill
Willeits, Chas, Totton Coldfield, Warwick, Beerhouse Keeper. Feb 26 at 3, at offices of Beaton, Victoria chambers, Temple row, Birm
Withers, Geo, Sevenoaks, Kent, Grocer. Feb 26 at 12, at offices of Carter & Bell, Leadenhall st

Wolno, Nathaniel, Burgh, Suffolk, Farmer. Feb 23 at 3, at office of Moulton, New st, Woodbridge. Welton
Wood, Hy Hall, Newcastle-upon-Tyne, Milliner. Feb 28 at 2, at offices of Bonsfield, Market st, Newcastle-upon-Tyne
Wood, Thos, Wakefield, York, Draper. Feb 27 at 3, at office of Fernandes & Gill, Cross sq, Wakefield
Wright, Charles, Harrow, Middx, Retailer of Beer. Feb 27 at 2, at office of Marshall, Hatton garden

EDE & SON,

ROBE  MAKERS,

BY SPECIAL APPOINTMENT,

TO HER MAJESTY, THE LORD CHANCELLOR, THE JUDGES, CLERGY, ETC.

ESTABLISHED 1689.

SOLICITORS' AND REGISTEARS' GOWNS.

94, CHANCERY LANE, LONDON.

The Companies Acts, 1862 & 1867.

Every requisite under the above Acts supplied on the shortest notice

The BOOKS AND FORMS kept in stock for immediate use MEMORANDA and ARTICLES OF ASSOCIATION speedily printed in the proper form for registration and distribution. SHARE CERTIFICATES, DEBENTURES, &c., engraved and printed. OFFICIAL SEALS designed and executed. No charge for sketches. Companies Fee Stamps. Railway Registration Forms.

Solicitors' Account Books.

ASH & FLINT,

Stationers, Printers, Engravers, Registration Agents, &c., 49, Fleet-street, London, E.C. (corner of Sergeant's-inn).

Just published, cloth, 21s.

A NEW EDITION of the PRACTICE in LUNACY, containing Notes and Schedules of Cases, Forms, Costs, Statutes, General Orders, Duties of Committees, &c. By JOSEPH ELMER, of the Office of the Masters in Lunacy.

STEVENS & SONS, 119, Chancery-lane.

CARPETS.—The new Dustproof and Washable Carpets are now much used by the Legal Profession for chamber and office floors; they are perfectly draughtproof, dustproof, and waterproof; requiring no beating or paper. Patterns, Testimonials, &c., may be had on application to G. F. CHILES, & Co., 57, Belmont-street, N.W.

BILLS OF COMPLAINT.

BILLS of COMPLAINT, 5/6 per page for 20 copies, from which price a large discount will be allowed if cash is paid immediately on completion of order.

YATES & ALEXANDER, Law Printers, Symonds-inn, Chancery-lane.

NATIONAL INSTITUTION FOR DISEASES of the SKIN.

Physician—Dr. BARR MEADOWS.

Patients attend at 227, Gray's-inn-road, King's cross, on Mondays and Thursdays, and at 10, Mitre-street, Aldgate, on Wednesdays and Fridays; morning at 10, evening from 6 till 9. Average number of cases under treatment, 1,000 weekly.

THOMAS ROBINSON, Hon. Sec.

LIEBIG COMPANY'S EXTRACT OF MEAT.

Most convenient, economical, and fine-flavoured stock for Beef Tea (about 2½d. a pint), Soups, Sauces, and made dishes, costing hardly more than one-fourth of what it would when made of fresh meat; keeps good for any time even after jars being opened. 1½b. jars recommended, being relatively the cheapest size.

Now permanently used in most households in town and country.

CAUTION.—Ask for LIEBIG COMPANY'S EXTRACT, being the only sort warranted Genuine and Perfect by Baron Liebig, the Inventor, requiring his Signature on every Jar.

PRINTING of EVERY DESCRIPTION, Legal.

Parliamentary and General—Newspapers, Books, Pamphlets, Prospectuses, Circulars, &c.—with promptitude and at moderate charges, by

YATES & ALEXANDER, Symonds-inn (and Church-passage), Chancery-lane.

ROYAL POLYTECHNIC.—Entirely New Enter-

tainment, by Professor Pepper, entitled Shadows, and the Story of the Shadowless Man!—Professor Pepper's New Entertainment, The Battle of Dorking Answered by the Autumn Marston; or, the British Army and its Stations. Patriotic Songs by Miss Alice Barth—New Musical Entertainment, by Mr. George Buckland, written expressly for him by the Chairman of the Institution, entitled The Ghost of the Toll-house! Illustrated with New Scenery and Spectral Effects. Mr. George Buckland will introduce many original Songs—The renowned swimmer, Marquis Bibbero, will enact The Drowning Man. Illuminated by a powerful light—The Arabian Mystery—"Christmas Comes but Once a Year," by J. L. Kine, Esq.—Matthews' Magic and Mystery—Dugwar's Juggling—Admission to the whole, One Shilling.

LEGAL AND GENERAL LIFE ASSURANCE SOCIETY,

10, FLEET STREET, TEMPLE BAR

(FOUNDED 1836).

THE PARLIAMENTARY ACCOUNTS REQUIRED BY THE "LIFE ASSURANCE COMPANIES ACT, 1870," MAY BE OBTAINED ON APPLICATION.

This Society has taken a leading part in freeing Life Assurance Contracts from all needless restrictions. The "Proposal Form" is most simple in its terms. The Policies are "Indisputable," that is, free from future challenge. The Invested Funds bear an unusually high proportion to the Liabilities. The Guaranteeing Share Capital of One Million (£160,000 paid up) is fully subscribed by 300 Members of the Legal Profession. Nine-tenths of the Profits belong to the Assured. Settlement Policies in favour of Wife and Children are granted in terms of the "Married Women's Property Act, 1870."

E. A. NEWTON, *Actuary and Manager.*

EQUITABLE REVERSIONARY INTEREST SOCIETY, 10, LANCASTER-PLACE, STRAND.

Established 1835. Capital paid-up, £480,000.

This Society purchases reversionary property and life interests, and grants loans on these securities.

Forms of proposal may be obtained at the office.

F. S. CLAYTON, } Joint
C. H. CLAYTON, } Secretaries.

UNIVERSITY LIFE ASSURANCE SOCIETY.

25, Pall-mall, London, S.W.

Amount of Capital originally subscribed, £600,000, on which has been paid up..... £20,000

Amount accumulated on Premiums 920,000

Annual income..... 95,000

Amount of Policies in existence and outstanding Additions, upwards of..... 2,200,000

Addition to Policies at the Ninth Division of Profits, 2½ per cent. per annum.

The Tenth Quinquennial Division of Profits, June, 1875.

CHARLES M'CABE, Secretary.

CLERGY MUTUAL ASSURANCE SOCIETY.

Established in 1829.

Office, No. 2, Broad Sanctuary, Westminster.

TRUSTEES.

The Archbishop of Canterbury.

The Bishop of Sarum.

The Archbishop of Dublin.

The Archbishop of Maidstone.

Chairman—The Archdeacon of WESTMINSTER.

Deputy-Chairman—ROBERT FEW, Esq.

Consulting Actuary—Samuel Brown, Esq.

Actuary—Stewart Heider, Esq.

Physician—Dr. Stone, 18, Vigo-street.

No Commission paid or Agents employed.

Total existing Assurances £4,956,105 0 0

Total Annual Income, exclusive of reductions in Premiums 227,982 6 2

Total Funds 1,891,915 12 7

Bonus allotted to Members at the Eighth Quinquennial Division of Profits 280,000 0 0

Bonus Reserve Fund 45,453 15 5

The Forty-second Annual Report, with a Prospectus of the Society; the Accounts and Statements filed with the Board of Trade, pursuant to the "Life Assurance Companies Act, 1870," with a short introduction by the Actuary; and Forms of Proposal, may be had on application at the Office personally or by letter.

MATTHEW HODGSON, Secretary.

N.B.—Clergymen and their Wives, and the relations of Clergymen and their Wives, are invited to make Life Assurances in this Society.

THE GENERAL REVERSIONARY AND INVESTMENT COMPANY, Office, 5, Whitehall, London, S.W.

Established 1836. Further empowered by special Act of Parliament, 14 & 15 Vict., cap. 130. Capital, £500,000.

The business of this Company consists in the purchase of, or loans upon, reversionary interests, vested or contingent, in landed or funded property, or securities; also life interests in possession, as well as in expectation; and policies of assurance upon lives.

Prospectuses and forms of proposal may be obtained from the Secretary, to whom all communications should be addressed.

WM. BARWICK HODGE, Actuary and Secretary.

OPEN STOCK EXCHANGE (Limited), 5, Leabury, E.C.

Is open to the Public from Ten till Four o'clock daily, for the Negotiation, Purchase, and Sale of Securities of all kinds. Sale by Auction, Tuesday at One o'clock. The Scale of Commission is fixed, at a very low rate. Orders sent by letter, telegram, or given in person, promptly attended to by a Sworn Broker attached to the Establishment.

For full particulars apply to the Managing Director or Secretary.

LAW UNION FIRE and LIFE INSURANCE COMPANY.

Chief Office—126, Chancery-lane, London, W.C. Capital, One Million Sterling, fully subscribed by upwards of 450 shareholders, nearly all of whom are members of the legal profession.

Chairman—Sir WILLIAM FOSTER, Bart., Norwich.

Deputy-Chairman—JAMES CUDDON, Esq., Barrister-at-Law, Goldsmith-building, Temple.

The Capital subscribed and Funds in hand amount to upwards of £1,330,000, affording unquestionable security.

The Directors invite particular attention to the new form of Life Policy, which is free from all conditions.

The Company advances Money on Mortgage of Life Interests and Reversions, whether absolute or contingent.

Prospectuses and every information, sent, post free, on application to

FRANK MCGEDY, Actuary and Secretary.

NATIONAL LIFE ASSURANCE SOCIETY,

2, KING WILLIAM-STREET, LONDON, E.C.

FOR MUTUAL ASSURANCE.

ESTABLISHED 1830.

This Society does NOT pay Commission for the Introduction of business, and consequently does not employ any Agents to recommend it.

But it offers great advantages to Assurers in the two points of most importance to them, viz.:

SAFETY, which is guaranteed by a Reserve Fund exceeding £500,000, being in the unusually large proportion of more than 90 PER CENT. of the whole of the premiums which have been received upon existing Policies; and

LARGE BONUSES, the whole of the profits being applied in the gradual reduction and ultimate extinction of the Assurer's premiums.

Prospectuses forwarded post free on application to—

CHARLES ANSELL, Jun., Actuary.

THE AGRA BANK (LIMITED).

Established in 1833.—Capital, £1,000,000.

HEAD OFFICE—NICHOLAS-LANE, LOMBARD-STREET, LONDON.

BANKERS.

Messrs. GLYN, MILLS, CURRIE, & Co., The NATIONAL BANK OF SCOTLAND, and the BANK OF ENGLAND.

BRANCHES in Edinburgh, Calcutta, Bombay, Madras, Kurrachee, Agra, Lahore, Shanghai, Hong Kong.

CURRENT ACCOUNTS are kept at the Head Office on the terms customary with London bankers, and interest allowed when the credit balance does not fall below £100.

Deposits received for fixed periods on the following terms, viz.:

At 5 per cent. per annum, subject to 12 months' notice of withdrawal. For shorter periods deposits will be received on terms to be agreed upon.

BILLS issued at the current exchange of the day on any of the Branches of the Bank free of extra charge; and approved bills purchased or sent for collection.

SALES AND PURCHASES effected in British and foreign securities, in East India Stock and loans, and the safe custody of the same undertaken.

Interest drawn, and army, navy, and civil pay and pensions realised.

Every other description of banking business and money agency, British and Indian, transacted.

J. THOMSON, Chairman.

LONDON-GAZETTE (published by authority) and LONDON and COUNTRY ADVERTISEMENT OFFICE.

No. 117, CHANCERY LANE, FLEET STREET.

HENRY GREEN (many years with the late George Reynell, Advertisement Agent, begs to direct the attention of the Legal Profession to the advantages of his long experience of upwards of twenty-five years, in the special insertion of all pro forma notices, &c., and hereby solicits their continued support.—N.B. One copy of advertisement only required, and the strictest care and promptitude assured. Officially stamped forms for advertisements and file of "London Gazette" kept.